DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 151 509 08 CE 014 705

AUTHOR	Harwood, R. Frank
TITLE	In-Service Training Programs for Supervisory Personnel.
INSTITUTION	Mississippi Univ., University. School of Business Administration.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO	498AH60019
PUB DATE	15 Feb 78
GRANT	OEG-00-76-03750
NOTE	77p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Education Programs; Course Objectives; Educational Needs; Educational Objectives; *Industrial Training; Industry; Inplant Programs; Leadership Responsibility; *Leadership Training; Management Development; Management Education; National Surveys; *Program Effectiveness; Staff Improvement; Supervisors; *Supervisory Training; *Training Objectives
IDENTIFIERS	United States

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to determine what is being done to develop leadership capabilities of first-line supervisors. Data was collected through interviews, examinations of company training literature, and primary resource materials at 125 manufacturing plants in fifty states which, in the aggregate, employ more than 155,000 production workers and have about 10,660 first-line operating supervisory personnel. The principal conclusions are the following: (1) The major broad and specific objectives for teaching leadership/management attitudes, skills, and techniques are being achieved in the programs examined; (2) some specific supportive leadership capabilities and functions (communicative skills, planning, organizing, and controlling) are being taught less successfully than overall objective priorities seem to warrant; (3) attitudes are receptive to the development of ongoing, escalating courses which are natural extensions of existing programs; (4) because planning, organizing, and controlling functions have much higher curricular objective priorities than apparent achievement strengths, some study of delivery systems for teaching these basic functions represents an educational and training opportunity; and (5) research associates who conducted field interviews have gained experiences to enrich their classes. (The appendix includes the interview questionnaire and lists of the research associates, plants, consultants, and resource materials.) (EM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED151509

IN-SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR SUPERVISORY PERSONNEL

R. Frank Harwood

School of Business Administration

University of Mississippi

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

OE 014 705

A COOPERATIVE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION INVESTIGATION TO DEVELOP IN-SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR SUPERVISORY PERSONNEL

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine what is being done to develop leadership capabilities of first-line supervisors.

An eight-page questionnaire was used in tri-level interviews at 125 plant sites in 50 states. Fifty-two teachers from many disciplines serving from junior high school upward assisted in the 73 Mississippi inputs. In 40 other states, 87 business executives/colleagues rendered sundry services, other than interviewing, facilitating this investigation.

Primary broad and specific program objectives include:

1. To develop leadership attitudes/knowledge/skills/techniques essential to get results
2. To improve communicative skills
3. To motivate and teach how to motivate
4. To learn how to solve problems
5. To develop planning/scheduling capabilities
6. To modify behavior, improve awareness/understanding
7. To demonstrate how to conduct on-the-job training.

Median and modal programs are 40 hours, given in six months.

Principal conclusions are:

1. Major objectives are being achieved.
2. Communicative skills, planning, organizing, and controlling are taught less successfully than objective priorities warrant.
3. Attitudes are receptive to ongoing, escalating natural extensions of existing programs.
4. Study of delivery systems for teaching planning, organizing, and controlling represents an educational opportunity.
5. Research associates who conducted interviews gained experiences which can enrich their classes.

A COOPERATIVE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION INVESTIGATION
TO DEVELOP IN-SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR
SUPERVISORY PERSONNEL

Short Title: IN-SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR SUPERVISORY PERSONNEL

by

R. Frank Harwood
Project Director

School of Business Administration
University of Mississippi
University, Mississippi

Mississippi Research Associates/Consultants

Sarah Anderson	Batesville	Charles Murphy	Mooreville
Paulette Baddley	Water Valley	Sarah Naugher	Pontotoc
Roy Bailey	Booneville	Lawrence Nelson	Yazoo City
Richard Baltz	Jackson	Mary Nevels	Fayette
Jackie Barkley	Raleigh	Faye Owen	Durant
James G. Brown	Columbus	Grady Palmer	Clarksdale
Robbie Carter	Myrtle	B. H. Papasan	Tunica
Tom Conger	Belzoni	Olivia Parsons	Canton
Sarah Costens	Canton	Jean Ricks	Wesson
Ann Culpepper	Rolling Fork	Dorothy Rieves	Tupelo
Jessie Cutts	Weir	Linda Russom	Port Gibson
Phyllis Daniels	Poplarville	Billy Scarbrough	Perkinston
D. R. Davis	Poplarville	Sara Shaw	Horn Lake
Betty Donald	Cleveland	Ethel Sikes	Carthage
Roger Duke	Hatley	Mary Sims	Oxford
Charles George	Webb	Sarah Smith	Vicksburg
Elaine Graves	Gulfport	Bruce Stirewalt	Starkville
Pat Griffin	Ashland	Carol Strickland	Ellisville
Frances Hardin	Calhoun City	Miller Stuckett	Greenville
Wonso Hayes	Holly Springs	Betty Swords	Senatobia
Minnie Jo Hill	Houston	Bernard Taylor	Winona
Joyce Johnson	Starkville	Maxine Thaggard	Marks
Anna P. Kelley	Perkinston	Margaret Wade	Tishomingo
Raymond Lane	Ethel	Sue White	Summit
Willodene Latham	Eupora	Elnora Wiggins	Itta Bena
Maggie Morris	Grenada	Vicki Wilkie	West Point

in cooperation with and funded by the
U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education
Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education

Project completed 31 December 77
Report published 15 February 78

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Because of the generous contributions of time given by 537 participants and supportive personnel (including 368 training directors, managers, and supervisors in 125 plants, 92 professional colleagues, business friends, and numerous interested and helpful people in many organizations), this study has been made possible. The cooperative spirit and willingness to accommodate an exceptionally stringent time budget, sometimes involving interviews in three plants in three states on the same day (U. S. Steel, Utah; Boise-Cascade, Idaho; Jantzen, Oregon)--frequently two plants in two states in a day--enabled the principal investigator to cover all 50 states (including the 82 counties in Mississippi) without missing a lecture class. Obviously, the dependability of the airlines and car rental agencies has been a major factor in making the necessary schedule feasible. A personal "thank you" to each of you for your contributions and your many forms of assistance.

For going that extra mile (before hours, after hours, holidays, at airports or in resturants, in your own homes, driving great distances, or with an unusual generousity in sharing materials), a "very special thank you" to Lewis Castle, Lockheed-Georgia; Tom Hoffman, Celanese; Thad Weaver (a fellow navigator from WW II), Hughes Tool; Frank Vassett (who got the writer involved in 19 Presidential Sports Awards Programs to help meet the rigors of the schedule), Honeywell; Bob Lancaster, FMC; George Young, Southworth Machine; Harry Eschedor and his whole team, Champion Spark Plugs; Larry Landrith, Coleman; Barry Hayslip, Jantzen; Sarah Zucker, Wickes; Gerald Peterson, 3M; and Ken Hall, PPG.

Without the thoroughness and followup of the field research associates conducting interviews in Mississippi, a major portion of this study could not have been conducted. The writer is indebted to each of you. To those of you who also went that extra mile--Joyce Johnson, Sue White, Richard Baltz, Roy Bailey, Mary Nevels, Jean Ricks, and Dorothy Rieves--please know that your added efforts are very much appreciated.

Some doors were opened; many conveniences were provided; a number of suggestions were given; questions were raised; and reactions were offered. For these courtesies and the many considerate gestures which have greatly facilitated the investigation and improved this report, the researcher gratefully acknowledges the contributions of Clare Berman, Marian C. Crawford, Robert L. Ferguson, Geneva and Leslie Folk, Sharon H. Franks, Miklos George, Dolly and Jesse Irwin, Herbert Jelley, Alexander, Alan, Dennis, and Irene Jezuako, Carl Jorgenson, Ted Kemp, M. O. Kirkpatrick, Elmer and Bernell Konradi, Mary McCarter, John McCreary, C. Lee Meyer, Clara Nassar, Ray Price, Eva Sullivan, and Marjorie Wilkinson.

R. Frank Harwood
Project Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I	THE PROBLEM	1
II	RELATED LITERATURE	3
III	PROCEDURES	10
IV	FINDINGS	12
V	CONCLUSIONS	38
VI	RECOMMENDATIONS	40
VII	CLOSING STATEMENT	43
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	45
	APPENDICES	
A	Data-Gathering Instrument	47
B	Mississippi Research Associates/Consultants	55
C	Data Inputs In Mississippi	56
C-1	Data Inputs In Mississippi (alphabetically)	59
D	Data Inputs Outside Of Mississippi	60
E	A Partial Listing of Resources Used By Study Participants	62
F	Conferees/Consultants Outside Of Mississippi	67

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	SUMMARY OF TYPICAL DAILY SUPERVISORY FUNCTIONS	19
2	ESTIMATED FUNCTIONAL TIME ALLOCATIONS	21
3	A SUMMARY OF DERIVED PRIORITY VALUES OF FUNCTIONAL RESOURCE EMPLOYMENT	24
4	PRIORITY RANKING AND PERCENT OF TIME COMMITTED TO FUNCTIONAL RESOURCE EMPLOYMENT	25
5	PRIORITY RANKING AND PERCENT OF TIME COMMITTED TO BASIC MANAGERIAL FUNCTIONS	25
6	SUMMARY OF SELF-JUDGED BEST CAPABILITY WITH FUNCTIONAL EVALUATIVE MEASURES INCLUDED	27
7	MAJOR STRENGTHS GAINED FROM SUPERVISORY TRAINING PROGRAMS	27
8	PROGRAMS SUGGESTED TO IMPROVE SUPERVISORY CAPABILITIES	28
9	SPECIFIC KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, UNDERSTANDINGS THAT WOULD HELP PARTICIPANTS TO BE BETTER SUPERVISORS	29
10	WHERE POST-HIGH SCHOOL SUPERVISORY TRAINING COURSES WERE TAKEN	30
11	SUPERVISORS' THOUGHTS OF HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAMS	30
12	SUPERVISOR FUNCTIONAL CAPABILITIES	32
13	MOST PRODUCTIVE SUPERVISOR CAPABILITY	32
14	MOST PRODUCTIVE SUPERVISOR CAPABILITY AS JUDGED BY THE SUPERVISOR AND HIS IMMEDIATE SUPERIOR	33
15	SUPERVISORY STRENGTHS TRAINING PROGRAMS ARE STRIVING TO BUILD AS SEEN BY SECOND-ECHELON MANAGERS	34
16	SUPERVISORY STRENGTHS TRAINING PROGRAMS ARE STRIVING TO BUILD OR HAVE BUILT AS SEEN BY FIRST-LINE SUPERVISORS AND SECOND-ECHELON MANAGERS	34
17	SUPERVISORY TRAINING PROGRAM CHANGES SUGGESTED BY SECOND-ECHELON MANAGERS	35
18	SUPERVISORY PROGRAM CHANGES SUGGESTED BY FIRST-LINE SUPERVISORS AND SECOND-ECHELON MANAGERS	36
19	RESEARCH ASSOCIATES' IMPRESSIONS	37

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Competitive productivity depends upon a number of factors. One of the more important of these is the quality of leadership at all echelons in an organization. Development of leadership capabilities among existing and prospective members of the supervisory personnel is an ongoing management responsibility.

Statement of the Problem

This investigation is addressing the question, "What is being done to develop the leadership capabilities of first-line supervisors?"

Definition of Terms

First-line supervisors are management designated employees one organizational step above the production line whose responsibilities include implementing all management directives/policies/requirements affecting workers assigned to them and facilitating production by exercising leadership in service and management functions.

Basic management functions include planning, organizing, controlling, and motivating. Although these terms are commonly used, definitions are given here to assure clarity in communicating the means by which inputs were gained.

> Planning is to determine a course of action, anticipating alternatives and resources required (manpower, material, equipment) to meet specific objectives (what is going to be accomplished).
>
> Organizing is to allocate resources (manpower, material, equipment) in a way that assures maximum productive effectiveness, i.e., getting the greatest possible quality and quantity of output at the least cost and in a way that produces a harmonious working atmosphere (who will be responsible for what and to whom).
>
> Controlling is to see that operations are moving according to plan in terms of cost and quality considerations, as directed by time and monetary budgets (how close to targeted operations is production and what needs to be done to meet or beat objectives).
>
> Motivating is to keep the team at peak performance with high morale (how to keep enthusiasm high, absenteeism low, turnover low, material waste low, machine down time low).

Delimitations

Data were sought from employers who are primarily in manufacturing categories of the Standard Industrial Classification. Employers in

Mississippi deemed by the local research associate to have a positive image in the community were asked to participate in the study. Employers outside Mississippi were selected on the basis of the principal investigator's 30+ years as a student of the markets and producers in this country.

Basic Assumptions

1. It was assumed that structured inputs from supervisory training program directors and/or instructors, training program students (foremen, supervisors), and the immediate line superior of the program users (foremen, supervisors) would provide critical core data essential to this investigation.

2. It was assumed that gaining data from a broad geographical spectrum of employers was one means to glean some of the effective training principles employed.

3. It was assumed that study input from a heterogeneous segment of industries whose employment rolls were varied would provide a means to discover principles common to the solutions of supervisory problems in general.

4. It was assumed that business and other vocational teachers and guidance counselors recruited as research associates/ consultants from educational institutions or agencies throughout Mississippi to assist in gathering local data would have an involvement beneficial to them, their students, their schools or organizations, and the cooperating employers.

5. It was assumed that large and small companies with supervisory training programs would be willing to share what they are doing in exchange for the prospect of learning what other approaches are being used to solve this problem.

CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE

"Gold" is wherever it can be found. Just look around. Not uncommonly, it can be found in some seemingly unlikely places, --right on top of the ground, figuratively. While Reece is not presenting his thoughts of observations as "gold," his material may be highly valued because it is fundamental to supervision and supervisory training.[1] Basic to the concept of role model, he cites Mager: "... it is through modeling that one learns to behave..."[2] Thus, a new employee tends to emulate the supervisor. Hence, management will find it advantageous to help develop the best possible model.

Some of the questions posed by Reece are germane to this investigation. In examining the wide range of supervisory-management positions, he asks, "Do these positions have anything in common? Is it possible to develop an instructional program that will effectively prepare people to assume leadership positions...?"[3]

To support his affirmative position, he identifies two important dimensions of supervisory leadership, supported by the research of Edwin A. Fleishman at the Ohio State University. These qualities are consideration (mutual trust, respect, warmth) and structure (planning, setting goals, communicating, scheduling, evaluating--employee knows what is expected).[4]

Reece makes three recommendations for improving supervisory-management training programs. To sustain the respect of subordinates when the new supervisor needs training experiences that will provide a foundation for success during the early phase of command, Reece suggests that this objective can be achieved by providing an opportunity:

1. To achieve increased self-awareness.
2. To study and internalize the basic principles of supervision.
3. To study and internalize managerial functions that are inherent within all supervisory positions.[5]

Among many suggestions, principles, tactics, and common sense suggestions offered by General Electric to its foremen, one formula is offered here:

---

[1]Barry L. Reece, "Upgrading Supervisory-Management Training in DE," DE Today, Spring 1977, Volume 10, No. 3, p. 1.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Ibid.

[4]Ibid., p. 2.

[5]Ibid., p. 2.

Consideration + Common Purpose + Planning = Cooperation
This thought is illustrated graphically with a smiling character watering a flower which is obviously thriving.[1] Reenforcement of the essential value of consideration gives an emphasis that merits attention.

Terry, in an office supervisory management framework, offers these guidelines. "Treating people like responsible adults, understanding human needs, and providing a working environment in tune with these human needs are the basis of effective supervisory management."[2] Implicit in Terry's statement is the factor of consideration.

In thinking about alternative delivery systems for whatever content may be included in a training program, an experience related by Dugan Laird is cited. In Germany he conducted a five-day-seminar on effective teaching. At the end of the week in a question and answer session, one of the students asked, "Why did you make us teach so much and tell us so little at the start of the workshop?" Laird's response: "Because you learned so much more by doing than you would have by listening."[3] This major learning key, participative involvement, can open minds more effectively than can any other single strategy.

Because acquiring and maintaining constructive attitudes seems to be one of the major thrusts of many training programs, perhaps a point of view offered by Joe Seacrist will be of interest. "... the hard fact is: training programs which change attitudes and beliefs without forcing changes in the environment will result in workers talking a better game but doing the same old thing. Is that what we want?"[4]

Inasmuch as management is a dynamic entity, there is an on-going concern for individual development. Welch makes this point. "... the only way that potentially high-quality people get to be high-quality people is through proper continuing education and training--the kind of education and training which raises the individual's standards, extends his abilities, and provides him with the skills he needs to train his successors and those he leads."[5]

---

[1] _____, The Successful Foreman, General Electric Co., 1965, p. 7.

[2] George R. Terry, Office Management and Control, Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1975, p. 534.

[3] Dugan Laird, "The Continental Syndrome," Training, March, 1976, p. 12.

[4] Joe Seacrist, "Don't Let Skinner Scare You," Training, February, 1976, p. 23.

[5] Robert G. Welch, "The Care and Feeding of Blue-Collar Management," Training Digest, May, 1976, p. 14.

Almost 20 years ago, Earl Brooks offered 79 criteria by which to measure duties within major functions common to managerial jobs. After examining these "functions"--planning, initiating, delegating, decision-making, communicating, developing, relationships, standards--those responsible for training might want to consider an interpretive application of his suggestion. "As a simple... analysis, ask what functions are most important to the job... what functions can... improve?"[1]

There are authorities who apparently like to take shots at management in general. But regardless of what their motives may be, some of their observations may have validity or foundation in fact. Peter Drucker, among the many things he has written, has two comments that suggest a need for a look at some training practices, procedures, and policies. "Management says the first job of the supervisor is human relations. But when promotion time comes they promote the fellow who puts in his paperwork... Management by objectives works if you know the objectives. Ninety percent of the time you don't."[2]

Mintzberg's arguments and evidence are based on upper echelons of management. Nevertheless, because planning seems to be so essential to all management levels, his findings may be of interest. He states, "Study after study has shown that managers work at an unrelenting pace, that their activities are characterized by brevity, variety, and discontinuity, and that they are strongly oriented to action and dislike reflective activities."[3] But orientation and dislike notwithstanding, if the manager doesn't plan, who does?

That there is a need for planning can be found in numerous ways. One among many vital statistics that seems strongly to urge resource development of many kinds in Mississippi is the fact that "...Mississippi is still 50th economically."[4] Economies in those states ranking 49 through 26 may relatively be less concerned with resource development. However, is there any employer in any state who can competitively disregard the need to improve line leadership of the first-echelon supervisors?

According to Kirkpatrick, "Very few organizations are satisfied with the performance of their first-level supervisors and foremen."[5] Citing

---

[1]Earl Brooks, "Yardstick For Future Managers," Nation's Business, August, 1959, Vol. 47, No. 8 (reprint).

[2]_____, "The Wisdom of Peter Drucker," MBA, October, 1976, p. 61.

[3]Henry Mintzberg, "Folklore and Fact," Review, January, 1977, p. 32.

[4]_____, "A Special Report--Ranking The State By Business Climate," based on a Fantus Company study used by the Mississippi Manufacturers Association (interview with Hugh Ketchum, 28 December 76), p. 1.

[5]Donald L. Kirkpatrick, A Practical Guide for Supervisory Training and Development, Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1971, p. 1.

University of Wisconsin Management Institute research, he states "... that foremen and supervisors are from 50 to 60 percent effective--as evaluated by middle- and top-management people."[1] He adds, "The main reasons for such limited effectiveness are that they do not have:

1. A clear understanding of what is expected of them.
2. The proper attitude and motivation to do their best.
3. The knowledge and skills that are necessary to do the job."[2]

Among numerous points made in Wikstrom's report, one facet seems to merit particular attention. After relating that very few (of 228) have formal means of follow up, he later states, "One of the nation's major 'think tanks,' which has found methods for analyzing the international political and military strategies of the United States and which advises states and cities on the potential effects of policy alternatives, reports, 'We have no formal way to evaluate our training programs.'"[3] Despite or because of the lack of formal evaluation, Wikstrom reports "About 75 percent of these organizations (228) ... are reasonably satisfied with the performance of their supervisors."[4] This appears to be at the opposite end of the spectrum from Kirkpatrick's judgement cited earlier.

Whatever dissatisfactions there may be about training, "Failure to apply fully on the job ..." is the most commonly reported.[5] However, if the man at the top knows and verbalizes (communicates) what is wanted, what is learned will be applied. The problem would seem to be at the top among those organizations that manifest dissatisfaction relevant to training programs. A large percentage of organizations are the lengthened shadow of one man.

In the matter of communicating, Heyel offers the Raymond Corporation as an example of one of many companies "... now giving lower-echelon workers more latitude in managing their own activities and in communicating directly with high-level executives."[6] The consequences of greater responsibility for lower-level employees "... increased productivity, reduced absenteeism and turnover, and the stimulation

---

[1]Ibid.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Walter S. Wikstrom, Supervisory Training, The Conference Board, 1973, p. 39.

[4]Ibid., p. 36.

[5]Ibid., p. 45.

[6]Carl Heyel, How To Communicate Better With Workers, Clemprint, Inc., 1967, p. 67.

of cost-cutting suggestions from the ranks. Ideally, this means higher profits."[1] By whatever means the ideal is achieved, as Eckles and others have observed, "Managers create and maintain an internal environment designed so that other people can work efficiently."[2]

Among other sources that directly or indirectly give fundamental support to the need for a developmental program, several additional references are cited. Because Malsbary's findings give a profile of personal characteristics essential to job success (hence, leadership developmental tasks), these points are mentioned. "... appear to be needed, regardless of the job family in which the worker's job is classified. These included: Accuracy... a sense of responsibility... being well organized, and an ability to work well under supervision."[3]

In his 1968 report from 353 businesses in 39 states, drawn from a population of 28,000 businesses, Bangs wrote, "Communication skills, both oral and written, are demanded. Both ... management... and employers... recognize a weakness... which is not being remedied by our educational institutions."[4]

In Mahaffey's study of changing occupational skills and requirements needed in Illinois, she wrote, "The ability to communicate and to interact successfully with people, to accept responsibility, and to be capable of leadership is developed not by talking about these qualities but through opportunities to practice them."[5]

From data collected from 1,232 workers across the nation, Lanham's work included in his summary, develop oral and written "communication skills adequate to instruct others or to modify office actions... The number of interaction critical incidents reflecting, 'thin-skinned,' angry workers almost caused us to add a 'fundamental' related to social graciousness in dealing with people within and without the business organization."[6]

---

[1]Ibid.

[2]Eckles, Carmichael, and Sarchet, Supervisory Management, Wiley and Sons, 1975, p. 3.

[3]Dean R. Malsbary, A Study of Beginning Office Workers in Connecticut, University of Connecticut, 1967, p. 119.

[4]F. Kendrick Bangs, Curricular Implications of Automated Data Processing for Educational Instructions, University of Colorado, 1968, p. 11.

[5]Anna Mahaffey, Changing Occupational Skills and Requirements Needed by Office Employees and Technological Development in Office Equipment and Procedures and Implications for Office Education in the Seventies, University of Illinois, 1969, p. V-11.

[6]Frank W. Lanham, Development of Performance Goals for A New Office and Business Education Learnings System, Ohio State University, 1970, p. 291-292.

Erickson, based on 300 jobs in the Los Angeles area, suggested that "... being placed in situations where they (students, employees) have to engage in problem-solving activities" would be conducive to productive growth."[1]

From 372 executives and supervisors in 160 companies, Harwood was given a number of curricular suggestions that give evidence of the kinds of developmental leadership for which they were responsible.[2] These included: give an awareness and some capability to appreciate and/or handle first-echelon management problems; develop communicative skills; and improve human relations knowledge, skills, and understanding.

In summarizing reported administrative or management trainee activities, Harwood found that communicating took 30 percent of the total job time.[3] He also reported that 60 percent of the jobs (96 of 160) and 13 percent of the activities (99 of 764) involved non-routine administrative duties relevant to customer/employee operational problems.[4]

In addressing the problem of identified needs of business employees, Harwood summarized, "Significant knowledge, skills, and understandings needed but not acquired in high school included: communication (24 percent, 38 of 160), ... demands and rewards in business (46 percent), and purpose of business (30 percent)."[5]

To summarize, in the business and educational press, industrial training departments' publications, trade association reports, university textbooks, and university research reports, there is evidence that seems to suggest that supervisory training has been the focus of serious attention and study. While the related literature of this report is limited

---

[1]Lawrence W. Erickson, Basic Components of Office Work--An Analysis of 300 Office Jobs, South-Western Publishing Co., 1971, p. 23.

[2]R. Frank Harwood, Assisting Local Schools in Modifying Their Business Education Programs, The Plan--TRACK IV, University of Mississippi, 1972, p. 18.

[3]R. Frank Harwood, Business Occupational Profiles In An Agricultural Economy, University of Mississippi, 1973, p. 34.

[4]Ibid., p. 36.

[5]R. Frank Harwood, "Can This Business Profile Help You?" Journal of Business Education, November, 1975, p. 76.

by design, some of the basic commonalities are cited from the selected references:

1. The concern for the attitudes, knowledge, skills, and functions of successful leaders
2. The fundamental objectives of training programs
3. The teaching strategies that are effective
4. The need for supervisory development

These few points may be adequate to invite further inquiry because of questions posed or solutions found.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

The principal steps in this study have been:

1. To develop a data-gathering instrument (Appendix A)
2. To recruit and brief associate field personnel to act as consultants and/or researchers (Appendix B)
3. To identify leads in Mississippi with or for field associates (Appendix C)
4. To get data from employers outside of Mississippi (Appendix D)
5. To follow-up problems/reports related to the data-gathering phase of study
6. To analyze, summarize, and synthesize the findings
7. To write this report

Based on the research of Malsbary,[1] Lanham,[2] Erickson,[3] and Harwood,[4] an 8-page questionnaire was developed in July, 1976. See Appendix A.

Recruiting visits, staff briefings, simulated interviews, and professional conferences were employed primarily from July-September, 1976, to organize the field force for Mississippi.

Using local resource persons in business, education, and industry throughout the state, an industrial directory,[5] and the principal investigator's knowledge of markets and employers, prospective participating companies were identified.

---

[1]Malsbary, op. cit., pp. 114-120.

[2]Lanham, op. cit., p. 31.

[3]Erickson, op. cit., p. 22.

[4]R. Frank Harwood, Assisting Local Schools In Modifying Their Business Education Programs, The Plan--TRACK IV, University of Mississippi, 1972, pp. 31-45.

[5]James R. Williamson and Norma T. Neill, Mississippi Manufacturing Atlas, Mississippi Research & Development Center, October, 1975.

With the aid of financial directories,[1-2] an extensive knowledge of more than 300 regional, national, and international companies gained from market analyses extending back to 1945, and assistance from a number of chambers of commerce, the researcher selected and interviewed employers and supervisory personnel in the other 49 states to contribute to this study.

Due to personal and professional problems, some of the originally recruited field associates needed to be assisted and/or replaced. This necessitated an ongoing follow-up, recruiting, training, and conference set of procedures and routines that ran the full gamut of time for the data-gathering phase of the investigation, July, 1976, through June, 1977.

Impressions from the field research staff were gleaned in individual conferences held principally during the summer months, 1977.

---

[1] Dun & Bradstreet Middle Market Directory, 1975.

[2] Dun & Bradstreet Million Dollar Directory, 1974.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Primary data came from 125 plant locations. See Appendices C and D. Twenty-five of the participating employers are among "The Top 100 Industrials 1977" (29 of the top 125 industrials), measured by assets.[1] Seventy-three plants are in Mississippi; 52 operational units are in the other 49 states. With minor exceptions, the participating companies are fundamentally or extensively in manufacturing. In the aggregate, these units employ more than 155,000 production workers and have approximately 10,660 first-line operating supervisory personnel. The parent and subsidiary companies represented by the units contributing inputs to this investigation collectively employ approximately 11,225,000 workers.[2] With 19,717,000 workers employed in manufacturing in June, 1977, about 56 percent (every other worker) of this nation's manufacturing labor force are to some extent affected or influenced by the supervisory training programs selectively summarized in this study.[3] In a total employed labor force of 82,868,000, one worker out of seven or eight in this country is in some way functioning within the spheres of influence of these programs.[4]

In Mississippi, the 58,129 employees, including approximately 4,775 first-line supervisors, in the cooperating plants represent almost 23 percent (every fourth worker) of the 232,923 workers in manufacturing in the state.[5] The cooperating plants are in 44 of the state's 82 counties. In the 38 counties not represented, no employers were found who had qualifying supervisory training programs. The counties from which study data were taken provided 80 percent of the sales tax collections in June, 1977.[6]

The 125 plants cooperating in this investigation ranged in size from 50 to 24,000 employees; in Mississippi from 75 to 24,000 employees. For the entire study, the mean number of employees in each plant was 1,290; the median, 500; the mode, 150. In Mississippi, the mean was 808 workers; the median 405; the mode, 150. The mean number of supervisors for all the plants was 91; the median, 28; the mode, 15. For the Mississippi plants, the mean was 67 supervisors; the median, 20; the mode, 15.

The in-service supervisory training programs offered by participating employers in this study range from six to 2,160 hours. However, the median and modal programs are 40 hours. Most typically, these courses are given over a span of six months.

---

[1] "The Top 100 Industrials 1977," Forbes, September 15, 1977, pp. 147-148.

[2] The Value Line, Volumes 35-47, June 3-August 26, 1977.

[3] Employment and Earnings, July, 1977, U. S. Department of Labor, BLS, Volume 24, No. 7, p. 69.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Williamson and Neill, op. cit., p. 70.

[6] "...Sales Tax...June, 1977," The LafaShopper News, August 2, 1977.

Objectives

What are the stated objectives of the supervisory training programs studied? Based on interview inputs, examination of company training literature, and primary resource material in 112 of the participating plants for which objectives were given or identified through program/course analyses, these statements summarize the apparent broad and specific targets at which these training programs seem to be aimed. In parenthesis following each statement is the frequency of occurence for each.

Broad Objectives

1. To teach and apply/develop/improve leadership/management/supervisory attitudes, knowledge, skills, and techniques essential to get results through people (112)
2. To get the supervisor introduced and oriented to the organization, including its history, and identified with the total program as a team member with a specifically defined role (32)
3. To meet needs identified by managers and supervisors (8)
4. To cross-pollinate thinking (2)

Specific Objectives

1. To improve communicative skills and understanding (81)
2. To motivate and to teach how to motivate (68)
3. To learn how to solve problems (66)
4. To develop planning/scheduling capabilities (65)
5. To modify behavior by improving awareness and understanding of human relations, growth, and development (64)
6. To demonstrate how to conduct on-the-job training (59)
7. To acquire the counseling skills to handle grievances and resolve conflicts (52)
8. To reduce cost through increased productivity (52)
9. To provide an understanding of organizing techniques and a grasp of organizational functions and services (51)
10. To understand performance appraisal procedures (43)
11. To know the "why," "what," and "how" of controlling (43)
12. To create a desire for and planning format to implement a self-improvement program (43)

13. To assure maximum safety consciousness, including knowledge of OSHA requirements (43)

14. To seek ways for consistent and effective administration of discipline (43)

15. To grasp the fundamentals of labor relations, the precise requirements of labor law, and the specific details of the labor contract (41)

16. To deal with the problems and ramifications of decision making (34)

17. To examine means used to gain job satisfaction, enrichment, and subordinate commitment/development (30)

18. To tighten quality control (28)

19. To enhance morale (26)

20. To consider criteria for the personnel selection/placement process (24)

21. To implement theory and practice through on-the-job training (24)

22. To acquaint the supervisor with effective time management principles (23)

23. To introduce experiences in dealing more effectively with counseling (22)

24. To establish a team pattern for setting goals and using Management by Objective/Supervision by Objective (21)

25. To experience team building tactics within a strategy that employs competition, cooperation, and conditions that cause problems (20)

26. To study company policies (18)

27. To show how objective, measureable standards are set (16)

28. To follow compensation plans to meet administrative responsibilities (12)

29. To devise strategies to implement change (12)

30. To gain insights and perspective through economics, budgeting, and financial accounting (11)

31. To practice conference leadership roles (9)

32. To benefit from transactional analysis (8)

33. To grow professionally through technical courses (8)

34. To give "union-free" supervisory principles (4)

Courses and Resources

Courses appropriate to the objectives identified in the preceding section of this report are listed in the literature provided by the participants in this investigation. While course/topic title variations are almost as numerous as there are cases in this study, the following generally reflect most of the typical subjects in initial programs for the about-to-be promoted or recently promoted first-line supervisor.

1. The Supervisor's Leadership Authority and Responsibility
2. Functional Communications
3. Effective Motivation
4. Understanding and Improving Human Relations
5. Meeting Planning, Organizing, and Controlling Responsibilities
6. How to Solve Problems
7. How to Train Production People
8. How to Reduce Cost to Improve Profit
9. Developing Skills to Handle Grievances and to Resolve Conflicts
10. Performance Appraisals and Growth Opportunities
11. Consistent Administration of Discipline
12. Safety Practices, Policies, Procedures
13. Labor Relations and Labor Laws

Appendix E lists principal resources identified by the participants. Some of these resources have provided complete, packaged programs, including instructors. Other resources have been used more limitedly.

Instruction for the programs included in this study is provided by local plant staff and operative personnel (61 percent), special college/university consultants (24 percent), and national staff (15 percent). Local operating line personnel who are used as instructors to provide a practical perspective and experiential understanding most typically do not have a college education. The local and national staff, as well as the special institutional consultants, usually are people with one or more degrees. Their backgrounds range from business to engineering to teacher education.

Presentation and delivery patterns among the contributors to this investigation vary and complete data relevant to time allocations are not available. Nevertheless, there is a common denominator among the programs studied. The well-organized operations are heavily action-oriented--the people-learn-by-doing approach as opposed to learn-by-listening, i.e., lecture. As a guide to program analysis, perhaps this model could be useful.[1]

Topic Breakdown (estimated from actual time)		Percent Of Total Time
New Concepts (presented by lectures, films, games, homework, discussions)	approximately	25
Insights (conveyed by surveys/inventories/questionnaires, lectures, discussions)	approximately	25
Skills (introduced by lectures, games, films, discussions, re: Safety, OSHA, EEOC/OEO, Salary Administration, Contract/Grievance Handling, Training)	approximately	25
Practice (gained through training exercises, i.e., role playing, games, buzz groups, discussions re: Concepts, Insights, Skills)	approximately	25

Method Breakdown	Number Of Activities	Percent Of Total Time
Presentation (lectures, films, games)	22	25
Reaction Response (structured group discussion and/or task completion)	10	25
Games and Experience	10	20
Open Discussion	All	10
Homework	6	10
Film and Tape Recording	6	5
Survey/Inventory/Questionnaire	11	5

[1]Tom Hoffman, Training and Development Superintendent, Celanese, Rock Hill, S.C., provided these data in an interview on 2 August 1976.

To meet needs beyond the foundational program that is given to the about-to-be promoted or recently promoted first-line supervisor, a number of participants (at least 62 of the 125 included in the study) are providing special modules of instruction. The flexibility and specifity of units of study designed for identified needs provide service and growth dimensions that are being advantageously employed. Illustrative of these instructional units are such titles as:

1. Management by Objective
2. Effective Time Management
3. Listening Awareness
4. Hiring
5. You and the New Employee--Orientation
6. Job Control--Men, Materials, Machines, Methods
7. Setting Performance Standards
8. Planning and Controlling Quality
9. Improving Performance
10. Facilitating Change
11. Building a Productive Climate
12. Transactional Analysis
13. Maintaining a Winning Team
14. Preparing to Conduct a Meeting
15. Identifying and Dealing with a Problem Drinker
16. Handling Suspected Drug Abuse

Some supervisory training programs include up to 100 individualized instructional modules. These may range in length from 15 minutes to 8 hours. Delivery systems include slides, audio tapes, video tapes, booklets, and programmed texts.

On the point of facilities and flexibility for training modules, Harold Hartline, American Cast Iron & Pipe Company, Birmingham, Alabama, offers these points about his company's "listening posts" that convenience employees on different shifts to receive training.[1]

> Find a small office that's not being used. Put in a desk, a coffee pot--that's the important thing--and a cassette player. Then put in a cassette library of whatever...you want the people to have.
>
> Set it up on a 24-hour basis so that people can come in whenever they can work it into their schedules. You can cover a lot of people this way and it doesn't disrupt production schedules.[2]

---

[1]As training director for ACIPCO, Harold Hartline and Sam Phelps, personnel manager, provided direct inputs to this study on 3 December 1976.

[2]Paul E. Deysher, "30 Training Ideas in 30 Minutes," Training Digest, Fall Issue, 1977, p. 15.

Supervisor Profile

The 114 supervisor inputs in this study are predominately male, 86 percent (98 men, 16 women). The most commonly used title among these first-echelon managers is supervisor (50 cases). Foreman is the next most frequently used title (33 cases), and department manager is a distant third choice (12 cases). One man has the title "foreperson." These line managers were born from 1915 to 1955. The median birth year was 1939, making the "average" supervisor in this study 37-38 years old. There was a tri-modal distribution of birthdates: 1934, 1943, and 1946. Eighty percent of these supervisors were born from 1931 to 1955, age 46 or younger.

Among the 38 percent with previous managerial experience, 56 percent had been foremen, managers, or supervisors. Of those with managerial experience, 37 percent had been employed in manufacturing; 22 percent had held officer ranks in the armed forces (sergeant and above); 16 percent gained managerial skills in retail establishments; and the remaining 25 percent had been in organizations in five of the other 14 Standard Industrial Classifications. Their prior managerial experiences ranged from six months to 25 years. Their median experience was 24 months; mode, 12 months.

Half of these supervisors have 10 or more years of fulltime employment with their present employers. However, the modal supervisor went to work with his current employer in 1973. In terms of total experience with the present employers, these participants were hired from 1937 to 1977.

Half of the supervisors who provided input for this study accepted their present managerial positions from 1955 to 1973. While the modal supervisor was appointed to his current job in 1976, there were participants (two) who are still in their first year as supervisors, promoted in 1977.

Most typically, the supervisor had been an operator immediately prior to being promoted. An operative job on the production line was held by 31 percent of the supervisors involved in this study. Such positions were held for periods of time ranging from one week to 216 months. The median operator was on the production line for 24 months; the modal operator was on the line for 12 months.

The next step up the managerial ladder for these supervisors most commonly is identified as "general foreman" (22 cases). Almost as popular as the next slot on the organizational chart is the title of "manager" (20 cases).

Of the 112 responding to the question of qualifications, 88 (79 percent) believed themselves to be adequately qualified for the next higher position in their organizations. Among the 24 (21 percent) who did not feel they would be qualified for promotion, 21 (88 percent) indicated that more education would be needed.

Supervisor's Typical Day

In response to the request, "Briefly describe what you do in a typical day," most commonly the supervisor would react with a shake of the head and a comment in this vein, "There is NO typical day." Nevertheless, the pattern of these average 12-minute responses to this open-ended statement shows a number of concentrations of activities/duties/responsibilities.

The day begins at least 30 minutes before the shift starts for at least 20 (18 percent) of these line managers. From the 114 supervisors, the following is a tabular summary of their reported daily activities/duties/responsibilities. For clarification, the first cluster of activities is interpreted as follows: Planning, setting priorities, scheduling, and coordinating shipping are reported by 102 supervisors, 90 percent of the participants identifying these activities as major responsibilities. In descending order of the percent of participants responding, the other 17 clusters of activities/duties/responsibilities provide similarly some insights into the characteristics of and, limitedly, the qualitative demands on the time in the supervisor's day.

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF TYPICAL DAILY SUPERVISORY FUNCTIONS

N=114

Activities/Duties/Responsibilities	Number Reported	Percent of Participants
1. Planning, setting priorities, scheduling, coordinating shipping	102	90
2. Controlling work flow	68	60
3. Assigning jobs/organizing work teams	66	58
4. Checking, reporting, getting ready, distributing, or ordering materials/ supplies	63	55
5. Observing procedures for efficiency, setting production goals, coping with budget controls, attending production meetings	49	43
6. Maintaining quality control	46	40
7. Keeping current shipping ledgers, production records, time and incentive factor reports	46	40
8. Coordinating team efforts, checking with preceding and following shifts	44	39
9. Building morale, motivating, counseling, and keeping communications open[1]	43	38

[1]Commenting on maintaining harmony, building morale, Elizabeth Schraff, Wembley Industries, New Orleans, a supervisor for 10 years and nearing retirement, said, "Smile a lot; love the work; love the people." 3 Dec. 1976

TABLE 1 - Continued

SUMMARY OF TYPICAL DAILY SUPERVISORY FUNCTIONS

N=114

Activities/Duties/Responsibilities	Number Reported	Percent of Participants
10. Determining available personnel	40	35
11. Advising employees about job-related and/or personal problems	39	34
12. Keeping machines functioning	39	34
13. Interviewing applicants, training new operators and new supervisors, leading and coaching subordinates, and writing standard operational procedures	37	32
14. Writing reports	37	32
15. Touring the facilities, spot checking equipment and production, checking the receiving area	27	24
16. Holding safety meetings, checking safety factors and housekeeping, giving first aid	25	22
17. Suggesting alternatives in production involved problems	23	20
18. Enforcing company policies, preparing reprimands, terminating employees	19	17

The same problem, "How does a supervisor spend his day?," was attacked on a structured basis. On the premise that all managerial activities/duties/responsibilities can be classified in planning, organizing, controlling, and motivating categories, the respondents were asked to indicate time allotments to these functions. Recognizing that the participants were estimating timeblocks, and that definitive distinctions among these functions would not eliminate all gray areas, the investigator offers these summarized findings as indicative of probable patterns. The reader is reminded that the judgments reflected in these time estimates are from supervisors whose median length of service is 10 or more years. As noted, N (the number of respondents) varies within the different functional categories.

To facilitate reading the following tabular summary of these findings, the first line of Table 2 is read: Of the 114 respondents (Column N), as daily activities, 10 supervisors (Column n), 9 percent, spend more than 3 hours in planning work for their operating personnel; 54 supervisors (Column n), 47 percent, report personnel planning requirements ranging from 1-3 hours; 49 supervisors (Column n), 43 percent, estimate requiring less than 1 hour to meet personnel planning needs. Under occasionally required activities 1 supervisor (Column n), 1 percent, claims that planning for operating personnel is a weekly responsibility in their operations.

TABLE 2

ESTIMATED FUNCTIONAL TIME ALLOCATIONS

		Daily						Occasionally					
		Over 3 hours		1-3 hours		Less than 1 hour		Weekly		Monthly		Yearly	
	N	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Planning													
Personnel	114	10	9	54	47	49	43	1	1				
Material	105	4	4	38	36	51	49	11	10			1	1
Machines	102	3	3	22	22	54	53	16	16	7	7		
Motivation	110	15	14	29	26	46	42	16	15	4	4		
Other	34	1	3	8	23	16	47	5	17	3	9	1	3
Organizing													
Personnel	114	18	16	43	38	47	44	6	5				
Material	100	8	8	33	33	50	50	8	8			1	1
Machines	97	3	3	21	22	55	57	13	13	5	5		
Motivation	106	9	8	34	32	50	47	9	8	3	3	1	1
Other	23			3	13	14	61	3	13	3	13		
Controlling													
Personnel	110	29	26	51	46	25	23	4	4	1	1		
Material	100	12	12	35	35	49	49	3	3	1	1		
Machines	98	14	14	23	23	49	50	10	10	1	1	1	1
Other	25	4	16	4	16	13	52	2	8	2	8		
Motivating													
Personnel	112	44	39	38	34	24	21	5	4	1	1		
Others	65	3	5	14	22	29	45	16	25	3	5		

Note: Rounding to the nearest whole percentage has caused some of the parts to gives sums greater than/less than 100 percent.

Because framing a question that is tightly structured may not anticipate all alternatives, the flexibility of an "Other" category is used. Descriptive details behind the "Other" selections are limited and not found in every category tallied. However, for whatever value these details may offer, they are presented on page 22.

Planning
Other (34 supervisors)
Daily follow-up; over 3 hours; 1 supervisor; 3 percent
Daily production scheduling; 1-3 hours; 8 supervisors; 23 percent
Daily next day plans; less than 1 hour; 16 supervisors; 47 percent
Weekly long-range production, projects, school instruction, MBO; 5 supervisors; 17 percent
Monthly quality control; 3 supervisors; 9 percent
Annual special project planning; 1 supervisor; 3 percent

Organizing
Other (23 supervisors)
Daily team cooperation; 1-3 hours; 3 supervisors; 13 percent
Weekly projects' requirements; 3 supervisors; 13 percent
Monthly safety and consumer problems; 3 supervisors; 13 percent

Controlling
Other (25 supervisors)
Daily quality factors; less than 1 hour; 13 supervisors; 52 percent

Motivating
Other (65 supervisors)
Daily efforts directed toward clerical and housekeeping personnel, department and plant managers, and suppliers; over 3 hours; 3 supervisors; 5 percent
Daily contacts with direct labor (other than those under direct supervision), service personnel, tool room and other supervisors, and the immediate superior; 1-3 hours; 14 supervisors; 22 percent
Daily time with production control and other supervisors, sales and service personnel, the immediate superior, and suppliers; less than 1 hour; 29 supervisors; 45 percent
Weekly involvement with other foremen and superiors; 16 supervisors; 25 percent
Monthly attempts with next higher authority; 3 supervisors; 5 percent

Looking at the broad functions--Planning, Organizing, Controlling, Motivating--the reported time commitments, as concentrated in several categories, may suggest priorities that could be useful for planning supervisory training programs. For instance, simple but arbitrary arithmetic for daily planning activities for operating personnel will be used to illustrate the point. Refer to Table 2 for values used in this model.

Planning, Line 1, Personnel

Column 1, Over 3 hours--use		3	hours
	x	10	supervisors
		30	supervisor hours
Column 2, 1-3 hours--use		1.5	hours
	x	54	supervisors
		81	supervisor hours
Column 3, Less than 1 hour--use		1	hour
	x	49	supervisors
		49	supervisor hours

Planning, Line 2, Material

Column 1, Over 3 hours--use		3	hours
	x	4	supervisors
		12	supervisor hours
Column 2, 1-3 hours--use		1.5	hours
	x	38	supervisors
		57	supervisor hours
Column 3, Less than 1 hour--use		1	hour
	x	51	supervisors
		51	supervisor hours

Planning, Line 3, Machines

Column 1, Over 3 hours--use		3	hours
	x	3	supervisors
		9	supervisor hours
Column 2, 1-3 hours--use		1.5	hours
	x	22	supervisors
		33	supervisor hours
Column 3, Less than 1 hour--use		1	hour
	x	54	supervisors
		54	supervisor hours

Planning, Line 4, Motivation

Column 1, Over 3 hours--use		3	hours
	x	15	supervisors
		45	supervisor hours
Column 2, 1-3 hours--use		1.5	hours
	x	29	supervisors
		43.5	supervisor hours
Column 3, Less than 1 hour--use		1	hour
	x	46	supervisors
		46	supervisor hours

Other reported frequencies under "Daily" and "Occasionally" Planning Activities/Duties/Responsibilities are disregarded because of their relatively limited numbers. The 12 products of these simple arithmetical computations in the preceding illustration reflect a rough basis for arriving at value assignments within a given curriculum pointed toward having students experience planning activities.

Using the same kind of an approach with the reported frequencies for Organizing, Controlling, and Motivating, Tables 3, 4, and 5 summarize these arbitrary value determinations. Because the primary inputs reflect the judgments of more than 100 first-line supervisors, the ordinal arrangement (highest product value first, lowest product value last) given in the Derived Priority Value column of Table 3 may be used as a guide in determining curriculum content and relative program time that may be justified. Column 3 in Table 3, Consolidated Priority Ranking, has been added to simplify interpretation.

Table 4 is a restatement of the essential findings derived from Table 3 with an interpretative column added to facilitate application of relative priorities. The ultimate consolidation of the findings on the basic time commitments is reflected in the functional summary in Table 5; ranking Planning first; Organizing second; Controlling third; and Motivating fourth, based on the derived percent of time committed daily.

TABLE 3

A SUMMARY OF DERIVED PRIORITY VALUES
OF FUNCTIONAL RESOURCE EMPLOYMENT

	Function/Resource	Derived Priority Value	Consolidated Priority Ranking
1.	Motivating Personnel	132	1
2.	Controlling Personnel	87	2
3.	Planning for Personnel	81	2
4.	Controlling Personnel	76.5	4
5.	Organizing Material	64.5	3
6.	Motivating Personnel	57	1
6.	Planning for Material	57	10
7.	Organizing Machines (use)	55	12
8.	Planning Machines (use)	54	11
8.	Organizing Personnel	54	3
9.	Controlling Material	52.5	5
10.	Organizing for Motivation	51	7
10.	Planning for Material	51	10
11.	Organizing Material	50	9
11.	Organizing for Motivation	50	7
12.	Organizing Material	49.5	9
13.	Controlling Material	49	5
13.	Controlling Machines (use)	49	8
13.	Planning for Personnel	49	4
14.	Organizing Personnel	47	3
15.	Planning Motivation	46	6
16.	Planning Motivation	45	6
17.	Planning Motivation	43.5	6
18.	Controlling Machines (use)	42	8
19.	Controlling Materials	36	5
20.	Controlling Machines (use)	34.5	8
21.	Planning Machines (use)	33	11
22.	Organizing Machines (use)	31.5	12
23.	Planning for Personnel	30	4
24.	Organizing for Motivation	27	7
25.	Controlling Personnel	25	2
26.	Motivating Personnel	24	1
26.	Organizing Material	24	9
27.	Planning for Material	12	10
28.	Organizing Machines (use)	9	12
28.	Planning Machines (use)	9	11

TABLE 4

PRIORITY RANKING AND PERCENT OF TIME COMMITTED
TO FUNCTIONAL RESOURCE EMPLOYMENT

Consolidated Priority Ranking	Function/Resource	Derived Daily Percent of Time Committed
1.	Motivating Personnel	13
2.	Controlling Personnel	11
3.	Organizing Personnel	10
4.	Planning for Personnel	10
5.	Controlling Material	8
6.	Planning Motivation	8
7.	Organizing for Motivation	8
8.	Controlling Machines (use)	8
9.	Organizing Material	7
10.	Planning for Material	7
11.	Planning Machines (use)	6
12.	Organizing Machines (use)	6
		102*

*Rounding has caused this column to be more than 100 percent.

Note that 60 percent of the daily time commitment is devoted to personnel matters.

TABLE 5

PRIORITY RANKING AND PERCENT OF TIME COMMITTED
TO BASIC MANAGERIAL FUNCTIONS

Consolidated Priority Ranking	Function	Derived Daily Percent of Time Committed
1.	Planning	31
2.	Organizing	31
3.	Controlling	27
4.	Motivating	13
		102*

*Rounding has caused this column to be more than 100 percent.

Comparing the frequencies of responses to the open-ended request, "Briefly describe what you do in a typical day," as summarized in Table 1, with the summarized functional analysis in Table 5, similarities are noted. As reported in Table 1, 90 percent of the participating supervisors (N=114) include planning in their responses to the descriptive request. This activity is the most frequently mentioned duty or responsibility. In Table 5, although not shown, planning is fractionally larger than organizing.

While there are a number of organizing and controlling activities/duties/responsibilities among the 17 other categories (after planning), this limited comparison will be confined to the highest frequencies in each functional classification. Frequencies of response dictate controlling as second in activity importance, ahead of organizing, the third-ranking duty in Table 1. These orders are reversed in Table 5. Organizing as a summary function ranks in second place. Differentials are 2-4 percent.

Motivating, as such, ranks ninth among the more detailed lists of typical daily activities in Table 1, well below organizing, which is the third most frequently mentioned responsibility. In Table 5, motivating has an 18 percent gap behind organizing (compared to a 20 percent gap in Table 1). However, motivating is slightly closer to controlling in Table 5 than their relative positions in Table 1. Differentials of 14 and 20 percent respectively are noted between these two functions in Tables 5 and 1.

Admittedly, these percentages are on different bases, so an exact comparison can not be made. The point that is being suggested in these findings is that the relative functional orders and apparent closeness in priorities bear examination. That these data inputs are lacking in precision is readily acknowledged. Nevertheless, the pattern of these reported daily activities/duties/responsibilities merits consideration.

Supervisor Concepts

To gain an idea of the self-concept of the participating supervisors, each was requested to make an evaluation of his functional strengths and areas for improvement. The evaluation form used is reproduced here. The definition of each function (planning, organizing, controlling, motivating) was read by the interviewer prior to each evaluation, item by item. Definitions are those used on page 1 of this report.

	Still Learning			Average				Very Strong		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Planning										
Organizing										
Controlling										
Motivating										

As planners, these supervisors evaluate their efforts with a mean rating of 7.4; their median, 8; their mode, 8; range, 2-10. As organizers, their mean rating is 7.6; their median, 8; their mode, 8; range, 3-10. As controllers, their mean evaluation is 7.7; their median, 8; their mode, 8; range, 3-10. As motivators, their mean, 7.7; their median, 8; their mode, 9; range, 4-10. These data are summarized in Table 6 on page 27.

Also asked, "Of all your activities/duties/responsibilities, what do you do that you feel most nearly fits the ideal for productive effectiveness--what do you do best?" These are the summarized responses elicited from 114 supervisors, together with the structured self-evaluations in Table 6.

TABLE 6

SUMMARY OF SELF-JUDGED BEST CAPABILITY
WITH FUNCTIONAL EVALUATIVE MEASURES INCLUDED

N=114

Capability	Responses	Percent of Supervisors*	Self Rate X	Md	Mo
Motivating	43	38	7.7	8	9
Controlling	42	37	7.7	8	8
Organizing	31	27	7.6	8	8
Planning	19	17	7.4	8	8
Exercising leadership	12	11			
	147				

*This column totals more than 100 percent because some participants gave more than one "best" activity.

The internal consistency of these responses may be noted in that the means and modes of the self-evaluation ratings place these four basic functions in precisely the order found from the ordinal arrangement of the data on this question.

The major strengths which supervisory programs in the participating companies have helped these supervisors to acquire are presented in Table 7.

TABLE 7

MAJOR STRENGTHS GAINED FROM
SUPERVISORY TRAINING PROGRAMS

N=114

Knowledge/Skills/Understandings	Responses	Percent of Supervisors
Human relations and motivation	70	61
Leadership	37	32
Communicating	16	14
Planning	14	12
Controlling	13	11
Organizing	8	7
Policies, procedures, labor relations	6	5
Better understanding of operations	5	4

The kinds of services or programs which these supervisors have suggested could help them to become better supervisors are given in Table 8.

TABLE 8

PROGRAMS SUGGESTED TO IMPROVE SUPERVISORY CAPABILITIES

N=114

Program	Responses	Percent of Supervisors
More programs of same or similar content with greater depth, more time, greater frequency, broader exposure	38	33
More management and leadership principles and skills, including MBO, transactional analysis, assertiveness training, problem seminars on local problems with basic functional applications--not models	20	18
More human relations	13	11
Experience exchange seminars, more time in other plants observing different methods	8	7
More on personnel policies and their fair administration	8	7
Improve communication capabilities, sending and receiving, oral and written	8	7
More on labor contracts/labor law/ labor relations	3	2
More on-the-job training with technical help, technical knowledge, and total operational knowledge*	11	10

*Listed at the end because the content is not management per se.

One of the supervisors in a non-union organization, a major employer with one of the larger work forces in this country, in response to the question of what services or programs could be offered that would improve supervisory effectiveness, said, "This is a fantastic place to work. It really is!" He had no unfilled needs in terms of employer-provided ways to grow.

In a more narrow form, the question posed relevant to meeting opportunities for supervisor growth focuses attention on specific knowledge, skills,

and understandings. The requested specificities are identified in Table 9.

TABLE 9

SPECIFIC KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, UNDERSTANDINGS THAT WOULD HELP PARTICIPANTS TO BE BETTER SUPERVISORS

N=114

Knowledge/Skills/Understandings	Responses	Percent of Supervisors
Management skills (planning, organizing, controlling, motivating, assertiveness, budgeting, computer use, costing, forecasting, problem solving, understanding total operations)	47	41
Psychology of handling people	36	32
Company policies, procedures (complaints, grievances, discipline, labor contract details)	17	15
Better communicative skills	11	10
More technical knowledge*	30	26

*Listed at the end because the content is not management per se.

Supervisor Education

The educational backgrounds for 114 supervisors participating in this study show the range from ninth grade (1) through a Master of Business Administration (3) and Law (1). The median and modal education is a high school diploma. These participants were graduating from high school from 1930 to 1972; the median year, 1961. There was a bimodal distribution for the year of graduation from high school, 1952 and 1968. Of the 19 supervisors with four or more years of college, they were getting their degrees from 1940 to 1977 (2); the median graduation year, 1969; modal year, 1972.

Of 112 for whom information is available, 90 supervisors (80 percent) have taken some post high school courses relevant to supervisory training. Training sources are shown in Table 10.

TABLE 10

WHERE POST-HIGH SCHOOL SUPERVISORY TRAINING COURSES WERE TAKEN

N=142*

Facility	Responses	Percent of Responses
Company Training Programs	78	55
Four-year Colleges	19	13
Junior Colleges	13	9
Adult Education Programs	8	6
Correspondence Schools	6	4
Business Colleges	2	1
Other Programs**	16	11

*Some of the 112 reporting supervisors attended more than one program.
**Special seminars are included in this category.

Of 108 supervisors providing the information, 70 supervisors (65 percent) took the general high school curriculum; 21 supervisors (20 percent) were in the college preparatory courses; 8 each (7 percent each) were in business and vocational-technical programs; and 1 supervisor (1 percent) identified the college-business curriculum as his high school program.

In the light of living and working experiences, these supervisors were asked, "If you were in high school again, how would you change your program?" Their responses are summarized in Table 11.

TABLE 11
SUPERVISORS' THOUGHTS ON HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAMS
(IF THEY WERE GIVEN ANOTHER TIME AROUND)

N=134*

Response	Number of Responses	Percent of Responses
No change	40	30
Take more business/vocational courses	39	29
Take more math, chemistry, science	23	17
Study more and accelerate	11	8
Take more English, communication	9	7
Take foreign languages	4	3
Seek counseling, don't know	4	3
Take college preparatory courses	3	2
Take general psychology	1	1
		100

*Some of the 114 supervisors gave several responses.

Supervisor's Line Superior Input

Some basic information and judgmental inputs for this investigation were sought from the supervisor's organizational line superior. If the findings in this study have some value, they ought to be related to ongoing positions that seem to be stabilized. In response to the stability question, "Will this job (currently held by the supervisor) continue in the next 1-3 years essentially as it is?," 106 interviewees of 114 (93 percent) said, "Yes;" 7 (6 percent) said, "No;" 1 (1 percent) said, "Don't know."

In the cases where the supervisor's job is to be changed, its scope is being redefined (2 cases); greater automation is to be included (1 case); only personnel with growth potential are to be promoted (1 case); the job will be eliminated (2 cases); no details are known at this time (1 case).

As far as entrance requirements into the supervisory position is concerned, 95 of 110 responses (86 percent) indicate that no changes are contemplated. Among the 15 plants (14 percent) which do plan to make changes in selection criteria, here is the information shared with the researchers. Higher requirements are stated in terms of

1. Greater process, product, technical knowledge/competence (7 cases)
2. More education (including a graduate engineer) (4 cases)
3. Need for more planning to develop management in depth (4 cases)
4. Higher human relations factor (2 cases)
5. Demonstrating more reasoning ability (1 case)
6. Having better communicative skills (1 case)
7. More expereince (1 case)
8. Being from outside of the company (1 case)

Several respondents gave more than one new criteria.

Screening devices used for promoting line workers include production records, 82 use (72 percent); tests, employed by 17 (15 percent); and other factors, considered in 82 cases (72 percent). Among the other criteria identified are: Getting along with others, 31 responses (33 percent); attitude, 18 (20 percent); experience, 12 (13 percent); education 9 (10 percent); initiative 9 (10 percent); motivation, 8 (9 percent); seniority, 5 (5 percent); appearance, 2 (2 percent).

As a means to weigh the relative judgments of the participating supervisors in this study, their immediate organizational superiors were asked to make the same functional evaluations that each supervisor had made. Table 12 provides a convenient comparison of the summarized characteristics of these independent evaluations.

The reader may note that of these 16 evaluative measures in eight cases these summary evaluations are identical. On those functions reflecting different evaluative summaries, there is no evaluation in any group that exceeds a judgment variance in excess of one unit of measure (on a 10-point scale, 10 percent). Of the eight judgmental variances, four are in the range of 3/10-6/10 of a unit of rating (3-6 percent on the 10-point scale).

TABLE 12

SUPERVISOR FUNCTIONAL CAPABILITIES

	Still Learning 1 2 3	Average 4 5 6 7	Very Strong 8 9 10
Function	Self Evaluations		Rated by Line Superior
Planning N=112	Range 2-10	N=110	Range 2-10
	Mean 7.4		Mean 7
	Median 8		Median 7
	Mode 8		Mode 8
Organizing N=112	Range 3-10	N=109	Range 3-10
	Mean 7.6		Mean 7.3
	Median 8		Median 8
	Mode 8		Mode 8
Controlling N=110	Range 3-10	N=109	Range 3-10
	Mean 7.7		Mean 7.2
	Median 8		Median 7
	Mode 8		Mode 8
Motivating N=113	Range 4-10	N=114	Range 4-10
	Mean 7.7		Mean 7.2
	Median 8		Median 8
	Mode 9		Mode 8

From the perspective of these supervisors' immediate superiors, Table 13 is a summary of the capabilities/characteristics/knowledge/skills which are cited as contributing most to productivity (what each supervisor does best).

TABLE 13

MOST PRODUCTIVE SUPERVISOR CAPABILITY

N=114

Capability	Responses	Percent of Participants*
Motivating	49**	43
Controlling (getting the job done on production/cost schedule)	40	35
Exercising leadership	34	30
Planning	19	17
Organizing	18	16
Knowing the operation and keeping the machines going	8	7
Communicating	6	5
Hustling	4	4
	178	

*This column totals more than 100 percent because some participants gave more than one "most productivity" capability.

**In describing the motivating prowess of one supervisor, one boss remarked, "His people would go to hell for him."

To facilitate another comparison of the thinking of the supervisor and his immediate superior independently responding to the same open-ended question, Table 14 summarizes Tables 6 and 13 in their common structures.

TABLE 14

MOST PRODUCTIVE SUPERVISOR CAPABILITY
AS JUDGED BY THE SUPERVISOR AND HIS IMMEDIATE SUPERIOR

N=114

Capability	Percent of Supervisors*	Percent of Line Superiors*
Motivating	38	43
Controlling	37	35
Exercising leadership	11	30
Planning	17	17
Organizing	27	16

*These columns exceed 100 percent because some of the participants gave more than one "best" response.

Note the identical relative orders of motivating, controlling, and planning. Observe, also, that the percentages of participants (supervisors and their bosses) for these three combined items (92 percent, supervisors; 95 percent, line superiors) are very close. Perhaps also indicative of the similarity of the thinking patterns of these first two management echelons is the fact that despite slight variations in the order of two of the five capabilities there is a gross differential of only 11 percentage points (less than 8 percent net difference on the broader respondent base.) The reader may appreciate the significance of this fact when reviewing the perspective of how these responses were obtained. In 228 independently conducted interviews, 33 field researchers asked the same open-ended, i.e., non-structured, question.

From the second-echelon managerial viewpoint, the major strengths of the supervisory training programs studied are summarized in Table 15.

Again, to make more convenient a comparison of the thinking of first- and second-echelon managers, as evidenced by their responses to the same unstructured question, Table 16 provides a summary of the common elements in Tables 7 and 15.

Among the eight categories of knowledge/skills/understandings identified by both supervisors and second-echelon managers, four capability groups--human relations and motivation, leadership, communicating, organizing--hold the same relative priorities in responses. Five of the eight groups in Table 16 have from no proportionate differences between supervisor and manager citations to a maximum of 2 percentage points. This evidence suggests a degree of similarity in thought patterns and judgments of these first two management levels that seems noteworthy.

TABLE 15

SUPERVISORY STRENGTHS TRAINING PROGRAMS
ARE STRIVING TO BUILD AS SEEN BY
SECOND-ECHELON MANAGERS

N=114

Knowledge/Skills/Understandings	Responses	Percent of Managers*
Human relations and motivation	64	56
Leadership	61	54
Controlling	30	25
Communicating	12	11
Planning	12	11
Organizing	9	8
Better understanding of operations	7	6
Policies, procedures, labor relations	6	5
Prepare supervisor for advancement	5	4

*This column exceeds 100 percent because multiple responses were given.

TABLE 16

SUPERVISORY STRENGTHS TRAINING PROGRAMS ARE
STRIVING TO BUILD OR HAVE BUILT AS SEEN BY
FIRST-LINE SUPERVISORS AND SECOND-ECHELON MANAGERS

N=114

Knowledge/Skills/Understandings	Percent of Supervisors*	Percent of Managers*
Human relations and motivation	61	56
Leadership	32	54
Controlling	11	25
Communicating	11	11
Planning	12	11
Organizing	7	8
Better understanding of operations	4	6
Policies, procedures, labor relations	5	5

*These columns exceed 100 percent because multiple responses were given.

The changes that second-level managers recommend as a "blue sky" input, i.e., no limitations on manpower or monetary budgets, are summarized in Table 17.

TABLE 17

SUPERVISORY TRAINING PROGRAM CHANGES
SUGGESTED BY SECOND-ECHELON MANAGERS

N=114

Service/Program	Responses	Percent of Managers*
More programs (of same or similar content with greater depth, more time, greater frequency, broader exposure, formal structure, better educational hardware and facilities, more professional staff)	79	70
More management and leadership principles and skills (including management/supervision by objective, problem seminars on local problems, basic functional applications)	31	27
More human relations and motivation	29	25
Improve communicating capabilities (sending and receiving, oral and written)	11	10
Experience exchange seminars (involving all departments, other plants)	8	7
More on-the-job training (technical help, technical knowledge)	6	5
More on labor relations	4	4
No changes needed	12	11

*This column exceeds 100 percent because multiple responses were given.

One final comparison of the relative thinking patterns of first- and second-echelon managers is offered in Table 18. This table combines the common elements of Tables 8 and 17.

In terms of relative priorities, the first three suggestions are seen to be sequentially identical. In proportions, the last four items collectively garner 26 percent of the citations by both groups. Thus, in broad perspective the ways these training problems and their solutions are seen seem to reflect some appraisal and judgmental patterns that are in phase with each other.

TABLE 18

SUPERVISORY TRAINING PROGRAM CHANGES SUGGESTED BY FIRST-LINE SUPERVISORS AND SECOND-ECHELON MANAGERS

N=114

Service/Program	Percent of Supervisors*	Percent of Managers*
More programs	33	70
More management and leadership principles and skills	18	27
More human relations and motivation	11	25
Improve communicating capabilities	7	10
Experience exchange seminars	7	7
More on-the-job training	10	5
More on labor relations	2	4

*These columns exceed 100 percent because multiple responses were given.

Research Associates' Impressions

Of the 52 field research associates or consultants on this project in Mississippi, 32 of these colleagues conducted three-level interviews required with the data instrument (Appendix A). Of these, 16 associates in personal interviews with the principal investigator shared some of their experiences which were judged to be professionally advantageous.[1] Table 19 is a summary of their impressions/observations/reactions.

[1] These 16 colleagues include 7 high school teachers (business education, counseling, distributive education, vocational business education), 6 junior college teachers (business education, distributive education, economics, industrial vocational education), 1 senior college professor (economics and management) and 2 university faculty members (business education).

TABLE 19

RESEARCH ASSOCIATES' IMPRESSIONS

Emphases/Experiences/Impressions	Number Reported	Percent of Reports
Heightened awareness of		
Leadership styles*, qualities, and effective use of psychology	16	33
Motivational needs	11	23
Realistic dimension essential to educational experiences (and concurrent need for continued emphases on fundamentals--communicative skills, grammar, mathematics)	11	23
Technical knowledge in all fields	6	13
Limited training and development programs in industry	4	8
	48	100

*One lady reported "...the contrast of petty jealousies where females are in command."

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the data gleaned from the participating plants and colleagues, these are the principal conclusions.

1. As measured by the broad and specific objectives relevant to teaching and applying/developing/improving leadership/management/supervisory attitudes, knowledge, skills, and techniques essential to get results through people, the programs studied seemed to be most effective from the supervisors' judgments in areas of human relations and motivation (refer to Table 7, page 27, 61 percent of the participating supervisors claiming this to be the major strength of the programs in which they were involved). Additional supportive evidence on this point came from second-echelon managers claiming human relations and motivation to be major strengths of their supervisory training programs (refer to Table 15, page 34, 56 percent of these managers cite these strengths). Therefore, these supervisory training programs are effectively teaching criterion referenced attitudes, knowledge, skills, and techniques essential to productive human relations which motivate employees.

2. Among the commonly endorsed broad and specific objectives (those identified at at least 50 percent of the participants providing program inputs)--leadership and essential supportive functions--the programs investigated are achieving their intended goals. Evidence of positive supervisory judgment on this point is less firm (refer to Table 7, page 27, 32 percent of the supervisors respond affirmatively) than the second-echelon managers' position (refer to Table 15, page 34, 54 percent respond positively). While the all-inclusive characteristics embraced in "leadership" apparently are being achieved with modest success, as judged by almost one-third of the supervisors and more than one-half of the second-line managers, there appears to be very limited success in developing communicative, planning, organizing, controlling, and other allied skills/knowledge, and understandings.

3. The fact that 33 percent of the participating supervisors and 70 percent of the participating managers indicate that more programs in greater depth with more frequency and having broader exposure would be helpful leads to the conclusion that a large segment of the programs in the plants studied have been successful in creating an atmosphere that is developing an awareness of managerial growth needs (refer to Tables 8 and 17 on pages 28 and 35). This frame of thinking is conducive to the kinds of educational involvements that can be productive.

4. The collective judgments of the supervisors and their managers in citing modest degrees of success in helping line management develop strength in planning, organizing, and controlling (refer to Table 16, page 34) point to the conclusion that some study of

more effective delivery systems for these functions represents an educational and training opportunity. Among the specific objectives in the programs investigated, page 13 (by frequency and percentage of participating operations), planning (65, 57 percent), organizing (51, 46 percent), and controlling (43, 38 percent) apparently have higher priorities in curricular plans than achievements realized. In terms of identified strengths being built by these programs, these functions are mentioned by supervisors and managers in these proportions:

a. Planning; 12 percent of the supervisors, 11 percent of the managers identified as a strength their programs are striving to build
b. Organizing; 7 percent supervisors, 8 percent managers
c. Controlling; 11 percent supervisors, 25 percent managers

5. Based on the reactions of 16 teachers/counselors/administrators who became involved in this study to the depth of conducting one or more of the three-tiered, on-site interviews required to gather the basic data, at least some high school, junior and senior college/university classes will be getting business management inputs growing out of direct data-gathering experiences of these field research associates.

Summary

These principal conclusions are reiterated in simplified form for emphases.

1. The major broad and specific objectives for teaching leadership/management attitudes, skills, and techniques are being achieved in the programs examined.

2. Some specific supportive leadership capabilities and functions--communicative skills, planning, organizing, controlling--are being taught less successfully than overall objective priorities seem to warrant.

3. Attitudes are receptive to the development of ongoing, escalating courses which are natural extensions of existing programs.

4. Because planning, organizing, and controlling functions have much higher curricular objective priorities than apparent achievement strengths, some study of delivery systems for teaching these basic functions represents an educational and training opportunity.

5. Participating field research associates who conducted field interviews have gained experiences to enrich their high school, junior or senior college/university classes/counselees/colleagues.

CHAPTER VI

RECOMMENDATIONS

Despite the usual resource limitations that available time and money impose on research, there are at least three groups which might advantageously use findings in this study. With this investigation as a point of departure, management training development officers, educational colleagues at various levels of service, and government agency personnel have herein data means to initiate action.

Management Training Development Officers

Recommendations offered to business and industry through those charged with management development of first-line supervisory personnel are in three categories. If circumstances are appropriate, the reader is urged to act accordingly.

Broad Program Audit

1. Use the findings, analyses, and models summarized here (objectives, courses and resources, and tabular presentations) as one means to audit existing programs. There may be a dimension to consider in such a comparison that will merit further investigation and/or development.

Specific Needs Analysis

1. Analyze internally generated current evidence to weigh strengths/weaknesses in communicative skills and planning, organizing, and controlling functions.[1]

2. Examine alternative delivery systems to develop higher learning levels in the functional skills--planning, organizing, controlling.

Escalating Developmental Program

1. Consider offering sequential, ongoing developmental management programs that build on existing offerings. Provide through internal or external means a way to capitalize on the first-line supervisor's desire to grow.

---

[1]As Sam Gould, training manager for Schering-Plough, said of his executives, "Their letters and memos have too much 'gobbledegook'." He is quoted from an article by Michael Lollar, "Help Is Provided Those In Trouble With Pen In Hand," The Commercial Appeal, November 27, 1977, page 12. Gould provided inputs for this study on 12 November 1976.

Vocational Educators

Recommendations for vocational education teachers at all levels of service --high schools, junior and senior colleges/universities--are in two categories. The reader's interest, imagination, and initiative will all be required to implement these suggestions.

Program Opportunities

1. Compare the 34 specific objectives identified in the findings (pages 13-15) with objectives in the courses you teach. You may find a number of opportunities for added emphases that could stimulate some of your students to higher achievements through knowing the management-relatedness of particular objectives.[1]

Three Challenges

1. How much more competitive will your students be if they can effectively communicate, motivate (themselves and others), and solve problems? Since these are broad management skills, the primary course content will generally not pose any implementation problem. Dare to implement the first three specific objectives of the supervisory training programs into one or more of the courses currently taught.[2]

Government Personnel

Broadly, recommendations for government personnel are also in two categories. Because in both instances these professionals are in supportive roles with broad policy guidelines dictating priorities, implementation may well depend upon fortuitous circumstances.

Research Personnel

1. Encourage through proposal acceptance further research into the nature of effective delivery systems for teaching communicative skills and planning, organizing, and controlling functions.

2. Provide two-year funding for studies of this scope.

---

[1] Jane Underwood, in "Leadership Training in the Business Curriculum," Business Education Forum, Vol. 32, No. 3, December, 1977, page 6, said, "Contrary to usual practice, there are areas of leadership training that can be studied in high school. They are self-confidence building, assertiveness, interpersonal relations, communication skills, group interaction, leadership traits, and work management."

[2] According to Robert E. Nelson, "Survival Skills: Mastering the Human Aspects of Work, " American Vocational Journal, November, 1977, page 64, "...communication, problem solving, and motivation...(are) skills...described as occupational survival skills..."

Vocational Program Specialists

1. Inquire of the vocational teachers for whom you serve as consultant/supervisor of their use of these findings. Their being encouraged to share their experiences in implementing suggestions from this study can provide you with service suggestions to others. Where models or means to implement recommendations have not been found, you and your staff have a challenge to help those in need.[1]

[1]While Mississippi is 50th in the nation in per capita income ($4,529, "Economics, Race Relations Boost State," The Commercial Appeal, October 23, 1977, page 3), increasing productivity and productivity awareness is a responsibility of every vocational teacher in every classroom in this nation. Part of the solution of the problem of trade deficits depends on knowing and doing something about the economic facts of life.

CHAPTER VII

CLOSING STATEMENT

Might may not make right, but might is a major means by which rights are defended. Commonly measured in business and political spheres in economic terms, i.e., productive capabilities, might, or the accumulation and use of productive resources, is a somewhat natural aspiration of man, individually and collectively. An individual, a plant, a company, an industry, an economy--all measure their economic might in some form that fundamentally is evidence of productivity. Thus, productivity is the foundation of individual and collective material well being, strength, or might.

Whatever means can be found that will more effectively improve leadership capabilities in virtually any facet of the production cycle must ultimately redound to the advantage of the individual producer. Effective leadership in every phase of production is reflected by ongoing improvements in the production records of those being led, i.e., the line worker in any line. The outcome of improved productivity is improved profitability, and profit is the generator that charges the free enterprise system. But the motive for gain is virtually universal. Therefore, providing means by which all members of the team may profit, i.e., gain more through increased productivity, would seem to be a major key to perpetuating the source of this nation's economic might.

The focal point of strength of any producing organization is on the production line. Inasmuch as one worker in four in this country is employed in manufacturing (19,717,000 of 82,868,000), and in "...1976...manufacturing was the state's (Mississippi) number one source of income...," it would seem advantageous to develop and foster programs which tend to enhance the system.[1] Firestone, International Paper, and Continental Can have programs directed toward line supervisors "...pounding the free enterprise drum... about the needs for corporate profits to fuel the country's economic system."[2]

Although this study was directed toward supervisory training programs primarily in manufacturing (essentially form producing), the functional necessity and contributions made by marketing, financing, and administrative services in all industry and trade are readily acknowledged. With relatively minor modifications in content (models, experiences, verbiage), the principles employed to help line supervisors to be more effective leaders (more effective through their helping their operators be more productive) may be almost equally applicable for supervisory personnel in other major functional areas--marketing, financing, and administrative services. After all, increased productivity in any area--producing, marketing, financing, servicing--tends to be translated ultimately into higher employee income,

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Lewis Nolan, "Political Economics Is Drawing Industry Emphasis," The Commercial Appeal, December 15, 1977, p. 44.

higher company profits, and higher taxes. This is the kind of game where everybody wins, if leadership is improved. With apologies to Gertrude Stein, "Leadership is leadership is leadership is leadership." Perhaps investigators in these other functional disciplines--marketing, financing, administrative services--would find an examination of this thesis interesting and productive.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

_____, "A Special Report Ranking The State By Business Climate," based on a Fantus Company study used by the Mississippi Manufacturers Association (interview with Hugh Ketchum, 28 December 76), p. 1.

_____, "Economics, Race Relations Boost State," The Commercial Appeal, October 23, 1977, p. 3.

_____, Employment and Earnings, July, 1977, U. S. Department of Labor, BLS, Volume 24, No. 7, p. 69.

_____, "...Sales Tax...June, 1977," The LafaShopper News, August 2, 1977.

_____, The Successful Foreman, General Electric Co., 1965, p. 7.

_____, "The Top 100 Industrials 1977," Forbes, September 15, 1977, pp. 147-148.

_____, The Value Line, Volumes 35-47, June 3-August 26, 1977.

_____, "The Wisdom of Peter Drucker," MBA, October, 1976, p. 61.

Bangs, F. Kendrick, Curricular Implications of Automated Data Processing for Educational Instruction, University of Colorado, 1968, p. 11.

Brooks, Earl, "Yardsticks For Future Managers," Nation's Business, August, 1959 (reprint).

Deysher, Paul E., "30 Training Ideas in 30 Minutes," Training Digest, Fall Issue, 1977, p. 15.

Dun & Bradstreet Middle Market Directory, 1975.

Dun & Bradstreet Million Dollar Directory, 1974.

Eckles, Carmichael, and Sarchet, Supervisory Management, Wiley and Sons, 1975, p. 3.

Erickson, Lawrence W., Basic Components of Office Work--An Analysis of 300 Office Jobs, South-Western Publishing Co., 1971, pp. 22-23.

Harwood, R. Frank, Assisting Local Schools in Modifying Their Business Education Programs, The Plan--T R A C K IV, University of Mississippi, 1972, pp. 18, 31-45.

Harwood, R. Frank, Business Occupational Profiles In An Agricultural Economy, University of Mississippi, 1973, pp. 34-36.

Harwood, R. Frank, "Can this Profile Help You?" Journal of Business Education, November, 1975, p. 76.

Heyel, Carl, How To Communicate Better With Workers, Clemprint, Inc., 1967, p. 67.

Kirkpatrick, Donald L., A Practical Guide for Supervisory Training and Development, Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1971, p. 1.

Laird, Dugan, "The Continental Syndrome," Training, March, 1976, p. 12.

Lanham, Frank W., Development of Performance Goals for A New Office and Business Education Learnings System, Ohio State University, 1970, pp. 31, 291-292.

Lollar, Michael, "Help Is Provided Those In Trouble With Pen In Hand," The Commercial Appeal, November 27, 1977, p. 12.

Mahaffey, Anna, Changing Occupational Skills and Requirements Needed by Office Employees and Technological Development in Office Equipment and Procedures and Implications for Office Education in the Seventies, University of Illinois, pp. V-11.

Malsbary, Dean R., A Study of Beginning Office Workers in Connecticut, University of Connecticut, 1967, pp. 114-120.

Mintzberg, Henry, "Folklore and Fact," Review, January, 1977, p. 32.

Nelson, Robert E., "Survival Skills: Mastering the Human Aspects of Work," American Vocational Journal, November, 1977, p. 64.

Nolan, Lewis, "Political Economics Is Drawing Industry Emphasis," The Commercial Appeal, December 15, 1977, p. 44.

Reece, Barry L., "Upgrading Supervisory Management Training in DE," DE Today, Spring 1977, pp. 1-2.

Seacrist, Joe, "Don't Let Skinner Scare You," Training, February, 1976, p. 23.

Terry, George R., Office Management and Control, Richard D. Irwin, Inc. 1975, p. 534.

Underwood, Jane, "Leadership Training in the Business Curriculum," Business Education Forum, December, 1977, p. 6.

Wikstrom, Walter S., Supervisory Training, The Conference Board, 1973, pp. 36-45.

Welch, Robert G., "The Care and Feeding of Blue-Collar Management," Training Digest, May, 1976, p. 14.

Williamson, James R. and Neill, Norma T., Mississippi Manufacturing Atlas, Mississippi Research and Development Center, October, 1975, p. 70.

DATA-GATHERING INSTRUMENT

PART I

Interviewer_____ Date_____

INTERVIEWS FOR SUPERVISORY PERSONNEL
IN-SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM

I. Employer Data (Card 1)

A. Name _____ Code (1-3)_____

Address _____

City(4-6)_____ State (7-8)___ ZIP(9-13)___

B. Executive Contact (14-16)_____

Telephone_____ Title (17-21)_____

Director of Supervisors (22-24)_____ Title (25-28)_____

C. Standard Industrial Classification (this unit only) (29-30)

1. ___Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing
2. ___Mining
3. ___Construction
4. ___Manufacturing
5. ___Transportation, Communication, Electric, Gas, Sanitary Service
6. ___Wholesale
7. ___Retail
8. ___Finance, Insurance, Real Estate
9. ___Services
10. ___Federal (Education)
11. ___Federal (Noneducation)
12. ___State (Education)
13. ___State (Noneducation)
14. ___County (Education)
15. ___County (Noneducation)
16. ___City (Education)
17. ___City (Noneducation)

D. Total employees at this unit (31) 25-49___ 49-99___ 100-199___
1 2 3
If more than 200, give number___
4

Operating supervisory personnel (32) 1-4___ 5-9___ 10-19___
1 2 3
If more than 20, give number___
4

E. Do you have a formal in-service training program for supervisor personnel? (33) Yes___ No___
1 2

F. If yes, how long is the program (34-35)___hours (36-37)___days (38-39)___weeks (40-41)___months (42-43)___years
Use necessary information to convert all responses to hours. Please give brief description and share whatever literature you have (to be kept in confidence, if specified). (Objectives, names of courses, resources used--texts, films, cases, problems--teachers--names, backgrounds, including years with company, if employees).

_____

_____

Interviewer_____ Date_____

SUPERVISORY PERSONNEL INTERVIEWS

I. Employer Data (Card 2)
A. Name_____ Code (1-3)_____

Employee Information

II. General
A. Name (14-16)_____ Position (25-28)_____
B. Sex (29) Male__ (1) Female__ (2)
C. Birthdate (30-31)_____ Year

III. Employment
A. What supervisory positions have you held prior to your starting to work for this organization? If none, write NONE in the first space. Place most recent first.

	Position	Months Employed	Type of Organization SIC
(32) / (53)	_____	(33-35) / (54-56) _____	(36-52) / (57-73) _____

B. Date of full-time employment with this organization (74-75)_____
C. Date of acceptance of present position (76-77_____
(Card 3) D. Previous positions held here (list only 2 most recently held)

	Position	Months Employed
(1-5) / (10-14)	_____	(6-9) / (15-17) _____

E. If promoted, what is the title of the next position up the organizational line? (18-19)_____

1. Would your present education, training, and experience qualify you for a promotion to this job? (20) Yes__ (1) No__ (2)
2. If "No," what additional qualifications would you need? (21)

Additional education__ (1) More experience on job__ (2)

Self-improvement of present skills__ (3)

Pass proficiency tests given organization__ (4)

Other (details, please)_____ (5)

IV. Job Description
A. Briefly describe what you do in a typical day.

V. Activities/Duties/Responsibilities

A. Indicate the activities or duties that you perform during a typical day, as well as those which you perform occasionally.

(Read definition of each term just prior to response for each section.)	Daily			Occasionally		
	Over 3 hrs. (1)	1-3 hrs. (2)	Less than 1 hr. (3)	Weekly (4)	Monthly (5)	Yearly (6)
Planning						
Operating Personnel (22)						
Material (23)						
Machines (24)						
Motivation (25)						
Other (26)						
Organizing						
Operating Personnel (27)						
Material (28)						
Machines (29)						
Motivation (30)						
Other (31)						
Controlling						
Personnel (32)						
Material (33)						
Machines (34)						
Other (35)						
Motivating						
Operating Personnel (36)						
Others (37) (Identify by kinds of positions)						

VI. Strengths and Areas for Improvement

A. On the basis of your contributions to your unit's productivity, rank your relative strengths (10 is most effective, 1 is least effective). This information will be treated confidentially, i.e., no one other than the research team will see it.)

(Read aloud definition of each term.)

Still Learning			Average				Very Strong		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Planning (38) _____

Organizing (39) _____

Controlling (40) _____

Motivating (41) _____

B. Of all your activities/duties/responsibilities, what do you do that you feel most nearly fits the ideal for productive effectiveness? (What do you do best?)

_____

_____

C. What major strengths has the Supervisory Training Program helped you to acquire?

_____

_____

D. What kind of service or program might your employer provide that could help you to become a better supervisor?

_____

_____

E. What specific knowledge, skills, understandings would help you to become a better supervisor?

_____

_____

Interviewer_____ Date_____

SUPERVISORY PERSONNEL INTERVIEWS

I. Employer Data (Card 4)
A. Name_____ Code (1-3)_____

Employment Information

II. General (14-16) (17-21)
A. Name (22-24)_____ Position (25-28)_____

Employment Preparation

Circle Highest Year Completed (top line)

III. Education
A. Pre-College (29) 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12
(1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10)

B. Undergraduate College (30) 1 2 3 4
(1 2 3 4)

C. Graduate School (31) 1 2 MBA 4 5 PhD/EdD
(1 2 3 4 5 6)

D. If high school graduate, year graduation? (32-33)___

E. If college graduate, year graduated? (34-35)___

F. Are you now taking, or have you taken, any post high school courses relevant to supervisory training? (36) Yes___ No___
1 2

1. If yes, where? (37) Adult Ed ___ Bus College ___
1 2
Jr. College ___ Four-year college ___ Company Training Program ___
3 4 5
Correspondence ___ Other ___
6 7

G. Which high school curriculum did you take? (38) Business ___
1
College-Business ___ College Prep ___ General ___
2 3 4
Vocational-Technical ___
5

H. If you were beginning high school again, how would you change your program? (39-48)

_____

Interviewer_____Date_____

SUPERVISORY PERSONNEL INTERVIEWS

I. Employer Data (Card 5)
A. Name_____Code (1-3)_____

II. Employee
A. Name (14-16)_____Position (25-28)_____

III. Employer
A. Employee's Supervisor (22-24)_____Position (17-21) (25-28)_____

IV. Employment
A. Will this job continue in the next 1-3 years essentially as it is?
(29) Yes___No___ Don't Know___
1 2 3

1. If no, will it be (30) Eliminated ___ Merged ___ Other (Specify)___
1 2 3

B. Do you plan to make changes in the requirements for entrance into this job? (31) Yes ___ No ___ Don't Know ___
1 2 3

1. If yes, please detail briefly._____

_____

_____

C. Which of these screening devices are used for promoting line workers to the first supervisory level?

Production record (32) ___ Tests (33) ___
Other (detail, please (34) ___

V. Supervisor Qualifications
A. Supervisory Employee Qualifications
1. Please indicate this supervisor's strengths and areas where improvements are to his/her advantage.

(Read aloud definitions.)	Still Learning			Average				Very Strong		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Planning (38) _____

Organizing (39) _____

Controlling (40)_____

Motivating (41) _____

B. Of all this supervisor's activities/duties/responsibilities, what does he/she do that you feel most contributes to productivity? (What does he/she do best?)

_____

_____

VI. Your Supervisory Training Program

A. What supervisor strengths is your training program striving to build?

_____

_____

B. (Blue-Sky thinking) What changes would you make in your program if you had the resources (manpower, money)?

_____

_____

MISSISSIPPI RESEARCH ASSOCIATES/CONSULTANTS

Appendix B

Name	Professional Affiliation	Location
Ray Adcock	State Department of Education	Jackson
Sarah Anderson	South Panola High School	Batesville
Paulette Baddley	Water Valley High School	Water Valley
Roy Bailey	Northeast Junior College	Booneville
Richard Baltz	Millsaps College	Jackson
Jackie Barkley	Raleigh High School	Raleigh
James G. Brown	Mississippi University for Women	Columbus
Robbie Carter	West Union High School	Myrtle
Tom Conger	Humphreys County School	Belzoni
Sarah Costens	Canton High School	Canton
Ann Culpepper	Rolling Fork High School	Rolling Fork
Jessie Cutts	Weir High School	Weir
Phyllis Daniels	Pearl River Junior College	Poplarville
D. R. Davis	Pearl River Junior College	Poplarville
Betty Donald	Delta State University	Cleveland
Roger Duke	Hatley High School	Hatley
Charles George	West Tallahatchie High School	Webb
Elaine Graves	Gulf Coast Junior College	Gulfport
Pat Griffin	Ashland Attendance Center	Ashland
Frances Hardin	Calhoun City High School	Calhoun City
Wonso Hayes	Rust College	Holly Springs
Minnie Jo Hill	Houston Vo-Tech Center	Houston
Joyce Johnson	Mississippi State University	Starkville
Anna F. Kelly	Gulf Coast Junior College	Perkinston
Raymond Lane	Ethel High School	Ethel
Willodene Latham	Eupora High School	Eupora
Maggie Morris	Rundle High School	Grenada
Charles Murphy	Mooreville High School	Mooreville
Sarah Naugher	Pontotoc Ridge Vo-Tech	Pontotoc
Lawrence Nelson	Yazoo City High School	Yazoo City
Mary Nevels	Jefferson County High School	Fayette
Faye Owen	Durant High School	Durant
Grady Palmer	Coahoma County High School	Clarksdale
B. H. Papasan	Tunica Schools	Tunica
Olivia Parsons	Canton High School	Canton
Jean Ricks	Co-Lin Junior College	Wesson
Dorothy Rieves	Tupelo-Lee Vocational Complex	Tupelo
Linda Russom	Mississippi State University	Port Gibson
Billy Scarbrough	Gulf Coast Junior College	Perkinston
Sara Shaw	Horn Lake High School	Horn Lake
Ethel Sikes	Carthage High School	Carthage
Mary Sims	Oxford High School	Oxford
Sarah Smith	Warren Central High School	Vicksburg
Bruce Stirewalt	Mississippi State University	Starkville
Carol Strickland	Jones County Junior College	Ellisville
Miller Stuckett	Greenville Vocational School	Greenville
Betty Swords	Senatobia High School	Senatobia
Bernard Taylor	Winona Vocational Complex	Winona
Maxine Thaggard	Quitman County Vocational Complex	Marks
Margaret Wade	Tishomingo Vocational Complex	Tishomingo
Sue White	Southwest Junior College	Summit
Elnora Wiggins	Mississippi Valley State University	Itta Bena
Vicki Wilkie	West Point Vocational Complex	West Point

DATA INPUTS IN MISSISSIPPI

County	Company	Consultant/ Researcher
Alcorn	ITT Telecommunications, Inc.	Roy Bailey
	Tyrone Hydraulics, Inc.	Roy Bailey
Adams	Johns-Manville	R. Frank Harwood
Amite	None Qualify	Sue White
Attala	None Qualify	Raymond Lane
Benton	None Qualify	Pat Griffin
Bolivar	Douglas & Lomason Co.	Betty Donald
Calhoun	None Qualify	Frances Hardin
Carroll	None Qualify	R. Frank Harwood
Chickasaw	Consolidated Packaging Corp.	Minnie Jo Hill
Choctaw	Belwood	Jessie Cutts
	Irwin B. Schwabe, Inc.--Ackerman	Jessie Cutts
Claiborne	None Qualify	Linda Russom
Clarke	None Qualify	R. Frank Harwood
Clay	Babcock & Wilcox	Vicki Wilkie
	Bryan Packing Co.	Vicki Wilkie
Coahoma	Cooper Tire and Rubber Co.	Grady Palmer
Copiah	None Qualify	Jean Ricks
Covington	None Qualify	R. Frank Harwood
Desoto	Dover Corp.	Sara Shaw
Forrest	Hercules	R. Frank Harwood
		D. R. Davis
Franklin	None Qualify	Jean Ricks
George	None Qualify	Anna F. Kelley
Greene	None Qualify	R. Frank Harwood
Grenada	McQuay Manufacturing Co.	Maggie Morris
	Rockwell International--Grenada	Maggie Morris
Hancock	Computer Sciences Corp.	D. R. Davis
Harrison	PACECO (Fruehauf)	Elaine Graves
Hinds	Allis Chalmers	Richard Baltz
	Armstrong Cork	Richard Baltz
	Packard Electric (GM)	Richard Baltz
Holmes	None Qualify	Faye Owen
Humphreys	None Qualify	Tom Conger
Issaquena	None Qualify	Ann Culpepper
Itawamba	Itawamba Manufacturing Co.	Charles Murphy
	Mueller Brass Co.	Charles Murphy
Jackson	Ingalls Shipbuilding	Elaine Graves
Jasper	None Qualify	R. Frank Harwood
Jefferson	Fayette Enterprises, Inc.	Mary Nevels
		R. Frank Harwood
	ITT Automotive Electrical Prod.	Mary Nevels
		R. Frank Harwood
	Jefco Manufacturing Co.	Mary Nevels
		R. Frank Harwood
Jefferson Davis	None Qualify	R. Frank Harwood
Jones	Masonite	R. Frank Harwood
		Carol Strickland

DATA INPUTS IN MISSISSIPPI

County	Company	Consultant/ Researcher
Kemper	None Qualify	Joyce Johnson
Lafayette	Emerson Electric	Mary Sims
	Kellwood Co.--Oxford	Mary Sims
Lamar	None Qualify	D. R. Davis
Lauderdale	Colt Industries	Joyce Johnson
	Peavery Electronics Corp.	Joyce Johnson
Lawrence	Kellwood Co.--Monticello	Jean Ricks
Leake	None Qualify	Ethel Sikes
Lee	Blue Bell (Lady Wrangler Div.)	Dorothy Rieves
	Rockwell International--Tupelo	Dorothy Rieves
	Super Sagless	Dorothy Rieves
Leflore	Baldwin Piano	R. Frank Harwood
		Elnora Wiggins
Lincoln	Jacobsen Manufacturing Co.	Jean Ricks
Lowndes	General Tire and Rubber Co.	R. Frank Harwood
		James G. Brown
	Weyerhauser Co.	James G. Brown
Madison	None Qualify	Sarah Costens
		Olivia Parsons
Marion	None Qualify	D. R. Davis
Marshall	Wurlitzer	Wonso Hayes
Monroe	Blue Bell--Amory	Roger Duke
	Walker Manufacturing	Roger Duke
Montgomery	Screw Conveyor	Bernard Taylor
	Window Manufacturing Co.	Bernard Taylor
Neshoba	U. S. Motors	Joyce Johnson
Newton	ESCO	Joyce Johnson
	La-Z-Boy Co.	Joyce Johnson
Noxubee	None Qualify	Joyce Johnson
Oktibbeha	Herschede Hall Clock Co.	Joyce Johnson
		Bruce Stirewalt
Panola	Panola Mills	Sarah Anderson
	Irwin B. Schwabe, Inc.--Sardis	Sarah Anderson
Pearl River	None Qualify	Phyllis Daniels
		D. R. Davis
Perry	None Qualify	R. Frank Harwood
Pike	Croft	Sue White
	MacMillan-Bloedel	Sue White
Pontotoc	Brookwood Furniture Co.	Sarah Naugher
	Keystone Metal Building	Sarah Naugher
Prentiss	Blue Bell (Wrangler Div.)-Enville	Roy Bailey
	Schweiger Industries	Roy Bailey
Quitman	Cook Industries, Inc.	Maxine Thaggard
Rankin	General Cable	Richard Baltz
Scott	None Qualify	Joyce Johnson
Sharkey	None Qualify	Ann Culpepper

DATA INPUTS IN MISSISSIPPI

County	Company	Consultant/ Researcher
Simpson	McCarty State Pride Farms	Jean Ricks
Smith	None Qualify	Jackie Barkley
Stone	International Paper Co.--Wiggins	Billy J. Scarbrough
Sunflower	None Qualify	Betty Donald
Tallahatchie	None Qualify	Charles George
Tate	W. A. Kreuger Co.	Betty Swords
Tippah	None Qualify	Pat Griffin
Tishomingo	None Qualify	Margaret Wade
Tunica	None Qualify	B. H. Papasan
Union	None Qualify	Robbie Carter
Walthall	Haspel Brothers	Sue White
	New Orleans Furniture	Sue White
Warren	International Paper Co.--Redwood	Sarah Smith
	Westinghouse Electric Corp.	Sarah Smith
Washington	Cooper Group--Nicholson File	Miller Stuckett
Wayne	None Qualify	R. Frank Harwood
Webster	Garan	Willodene Latham
	Wells Lamont	Willodene Latham
Wilkinson	The William Carter Co.	Sue White
Winston	Georgia Pacific	Joyce Johnson
	Taylor Machine Works	Joyce Johnson
Yalobusha	Big Yank	Paulette Baddley
	Holley Carburetor	Paulette Baddley
Yazoo	Mississippi Chemical Corp.	Lawrence Nelson

DATA INPUTS IN MISSISSIPPI
(alphabetically)

Company	Company
Allis Chalmers	ITT Telecommunications, Inc.
Armstrong Cork	Jacobsen Manufacturing Co.
Babcock & Wilcox	Jefco Manufacturing Co.
Baldwin Piano	Johns-Manville
Belwood	Kellwood Co.--Monticello
Big Yank	Kellwood Co.--Oxford
Blue Bell--Amory	Keystone Metal Building
Blue Bell (Wrangler)--Booneville	W. A. Kreuger Co.
Blue Bell (Lady Wrangler)--Tupelo	La-Z-Boy Co.
Brookwood Furniture Co.	MacMillan-Bloedel
Bryan Packing Co.	Masonite
The William Carter Co.	McCarty State Pride Farms
Colt Industries	McQuay Manufacturing Co.
Computer Sciences Corp.	Mississippi Chemical Corp.
Consolidated Packaging Corp.	Mueller Brass Mfg. Co.
Cook Industries, Inc.	New Orleans Furniture
Cooper Group--Nicholson File	Packard Electric (GM)
Cooper Tire and Rubber Co.	PACECO (Fruehauf)
Croft	Panola Mills, Inc.
Douglas & Lomason Co.	Peavey Electronics Corp.
Dover Corp.	Rockwell International--Grenada
ESCO	Rockwell International--Tupelo
Emerson Electric Co.	Super Sagless
Fayette Enterprises, Inc.	Irwin B. Schwabe, Inc.--Ackerman
Garan	Irwin B. Schwabe, Inc.--Tupelo
General Cable	Schweiger Industries
General Tire and Rubber Co.	Screw Conveyor
Georgia Pacific	Taylor Machine Works
Haspel Brothers	Tyrone Hydraulics, Inc.
Hercules	U. S. Motors
Herschede Hall Clock Co.	Walker Manufacturing
Holley Carburetor	Wells Lamont
Ingalls Shipbuilding	Westinghouse Electric Corp.
International Paper Co.--Redwood	Weyerhauser Co.
International Paper Co.--Wiggins	Window Manufacturing Co.
Itawamba Manufacturing Co.	Wurlitzer
ITT Automotive Electrical Products	

DATA INPUTS OUTSIDE OF MISSISSIPPI

State	Company
Alabama	American Cast Iron Pipe
Alaska	RCA
Arizona	Honeywell
Arkansas	Timex
California	Wickes
Colorado	Johns-Manville
Connecticut	American Can
Delaware	Hercules Powder
Florida	Florida Wire and Cable
Georgia	Lockheed-Georgia
Hawaii	Dole Pineapple (Castle & Cooke)
Idaho	Boise Cascade
Illinois	Gardner-Denver
Indiana	Windsor Plastics (AMC)
Iowa	John Deere
Kansas	Coleman
Kentucky	FMC
Louisiana	Wembley Industries
Maine	Southworth Machine
Maryland	Black and Decker
Massachusetts	Wang Laboratories
Michigan	Kellogg
Minnesota	3M Company
Missouri	Emerson Electric
Montana	Champion Building Products

DATA INPUTS OUTSIDE OF MISSISSIPPI

State	Company
Nebraska	Control Data
Nevada	Titanium
New Hampshire	W. R. Grace
New Jersey	Johnson and Johnson
New Mexico	Amity
New York	Eastman Kodak Xerox
North Carolina	Cannon Mills
North Dakota	Steiger Tractor
Ohio	Champion Spark Plugs
Oklahoma	Company X
Oregon	Jantzen
Pennsylvania	PPG Industries
Rhode Island	Bostitch (Textron)
South Carolina	Celanese
South Dakota	Raven Industries
Tennessee	Blue Cross/Blue Shield McKee Baking Company Schering-Plough
Texas	Hughes Tool
Utah	U. S. Steel
Vermont	General Electric
Virginia	Philip Morris
Washington	Scott Paper Co.
West Virginia	Union Carbide
Wisconsin	Miller Brewing
Wyoming	Wyott

A PARTIAL LISTING OF RESOURCES USED BY STUDY PARTICIPANTS

_____, Management Development Program--Fall 76, American Association of Industrial Management (St. Louis, MO).

_____, American Association of Industrial Management 1977 Spring Catalog, (Waltham, MA).

_____, Management Development Guide, March-August, 1977, American Management Association.

_____, Supervisory Management Course, American Management Association, 1969.

_____, Developing Employees, American Petroleum Institute, 1974.

_____, Human Relations, American Petroleum Institute, 1974.

_____, BNA Communications, Inc., Film Catalog, BNA Communications.

_____, "Better Materials Handling," Dynamic Supervision, Bureau of Business Practice, No. 157, July 10, 1968.

_____, Communicating...Down to Cases, Bureau of Business Practice, No. 101, 1971.

_____, The Supervisor's Problem-Solving Series, Bureau of Business Practice, No. 116, 1971.

_____, The Dale Carnegie Management Seminar, Dale Carnegie & Associates.

_____, Foremen Supervisory Development Pilot Program--Celriver, Celanese Fibers Company, 1972.

_____, 1977 Training Program, Manufacturing Training & Development, Champion, January 31, 1977.

_____, Human Resource Development, HRD Bulletin, Control Data Corporation, April-June, 1977.

_____, Supervisory Skills Seminar, John Deere, 1977.

_____, Development Dimensions, Inc., 1975.

_____, A Catalog of Ideas for Action Oriented Training/Communicating, 9th Edition, Didactic Systems, Inc., 1977-78.

_____, Foremen/Supervisor Program, General Electric Management Development Institute, 1976.

_____, A TA Notebook/A Guide to More Productive Communication, Johnson and Johnson, 1975.

_____, 1977 Management Development Seminars, Kellogg Company.

_____, performance appraisal, Kellogg Company.

_____, The Management Process--Supervisory Training Program, Kingswell Group, Work Clothes Division, Kellwood Company.

_____, Supervisory Skills Series, Employee Motivation, Litton Industries.

_____, Supervisory Skills Series, Job Enrichment, Litton Industries.

_____, Supervisory Skills Series, Performance Appraisal, Litton Industries.

_____, Supervisory Skills Series, Problem Solving, Litton Industries.

_____, Supervisory Skills Series, Supervisory Communications, Litton Industries.

_____, Supervisory Skills Series, The Supervisor's Job, Litton Industries.

_____, Supervisory Skills Series, Training Subordiantes, Litton Industries.

_____, Supervisory Skills Series, Wage and Salary Administration, Litton Industries.

_____, Manufacturing Supervisory Development Program, Lockheed-Georgia, 1st Quarter, 1976.

_____, Fundamentals of Supervision, Maynard Training Center.

_____, Working Effectively With People, Maynard Training Center.

_____, Management by Objectives, Media Learning Corporation, 1967.

_____, Discipline and Grievances, National Foreman's Institute, 1977.

_____, Key Man Development Course, National Safety Council, 1974.

_____, Effective Communication, Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education.

_____, Employee Safety and Health, Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education.

_____, Principles of Supervision, Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education, 1973.

_____, Working With People (Supervisory Development), Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education.

_____, Supervisors' Training Resource Library, Pilot Project, PPG Industries, May 1, 1977.

_____, Supervisory and Management Training Seminar, RCA, February 24-25, 1977.

_____, "Strengthen Your Hand In '77," RIA Supervisory Alert, February 8, 1977.

_____, "A Manager's Guide To Curing Poor Employee Performance," RIA Supervisory Alert, August 3, 1977.

_____, Roundtable Films, 1977.

_____, "Steiger Wants To Know--Tell It Like It Is! Employee Survey," Steiger, February, 1977.

_____, Training Program--Manufacturing Staff, Steiger Tractor, Inc., December, 1976.

_____, Your Responsibilities As An Effective Supervisor, Taylor Machine Works.

Anderson, Gordon N., Human Resources Development and Training (Program Directory), Black and Decker.

Anderson, R. L., Training & Development, Champion, April 15, 1976.

Anderson, R. L., Effective Communications, Champion Spark Plugs.

Anderson, R. L., Human Relations, Champion Spark Plugs.

Anderson, R. L., Work Simplification, Champion Spark Plugs.

Bittel, Lester R., Improving Supervisory Performance, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1976.

Bittel, Lester R., Improving Supervisory Performance--Performance Portfolio, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1976.

Bittel, Lester R., Performance Portfolio for what Every Supervisory Should Know, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1974.

Boyd, Bradford B., Management-Minded Supervision, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1976.

Broadwell, Martin M., The New Supervisor, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1970.

Brown, Jerry, Construction Supervisory Training Programs, The Associated General Contractors of America/McKnight Publishing Co.

Carnegie, Dale, The Dale Carnegie Course in Effective Speaking and Human Relations, Dale Carnegie & Associates, Inc., 1974.

Drefack, Raymond, Quality Control, The Dartnell Corporation, 1964.

Elsen, Paul R., Honeywell Control Systems Training Department--1972 Seminars, Honeywell.

Gelvin, Gerald D., Effective Labor Relations For Management, Hercules Incorporated.

Guyon, Richard and Jones, William, You--The Supervisor, Professional Development, Inc., 1974.

Haimann, Theo and Hilgert, Raymond L., Supervision: Concepts and Practices of Management, South-Western Publishing Co., 1972.

Hoffman, T. S., Helping Process, Celanese Fibers Company, June, 1976.

Hyslip, Barry, Cassette Tape/Film Library and Performance Appraisal Subject Index, Jantzen, February, 1976.

Lefton, R. E., Buzzotta, V. R., and Sherberg, Mannie, Dimensional Management Strategies, Psychological Associates, Inc., 1970.

Levy, William, Conference Leadership, Champion Spark Plug Company, 3-4 February, 1976.

Mager, Robert F. and Beach, Kenneth M., Jr., Developing Vocational Instruction, Lear Siegler, Inc./Fearon Publishers, 1967.

Miller, Lawrence M., Behavior Management--New Skills for Business and Industry, Human Behavior Institute, Inc., 1974.

Parker, Beyer V., The Dynamics of Supervision, McGraw-Hill/Gregg Management in Marketing, 1971.

Reece, Barry L. and Manning, Gerald L., Wilson RV--An In-Basket Simulation for Supervisory and Management Development, Gregg McGraw-Hill, 1977.

Vaughan, James and Deep, Samuel D., Program of Exercises for Management and Organizational Behavioral, Glencoe Press, 1975.

Williams, J. Clifton, Dynamics of Supervision, Success Motivation Institute, Inc., 1967.

Young, George, Internal Management Development (Self Improvement Series), Southworth Machine Co., February 2, 1977.

Films*

"The Supervisory Grid"
"Planning"
"Organizing"
"Controlling"
Available through BNA Communications

"The People on Market Street" (A 7-film series)
Available through Walt Disney Educational Media Company

*Numerous participating company resource catalogs identify many titles that serve various supervisory training needs. Such lists will not be included in this report.

Television

"Human Relations & Motivation," produced by Applied Management Science; shown, Winter, 1977, Michigan.

"Modern Supervisory Techniques," produced by Applied Management Science; shown, Spring, 1977, Michigan.

The films which accompany the eight-session program,"You--The Supervisor," have been booked for broadcast over Mississippi Educational Television.[1]

---

[1]Vern L. Jacobs, Executive Vice President, Professional Development, Inc., wrote this in a letter to this researcher on July 23, 1977.

CONFEREES/CONSULTANTS OUTSIDE OF MISSISSIPPI

State	Person	Organization
Alabama	Sam Strickland	City of Birmingham (retired)
Alaska	Lou Amadril	British Petroleum
Alaska	Claire Banks	Anchorage Chamber of Commerce
Alaska	Mrs. T. J. Swanson	Retired Teacher
Arizona	Sid Hirsch	Self-employed
Arizona	Neal McLaughlin	Motorola
Arkansas	Marian C. Crawford	University of Arkansas/Little Rock
Arkansas	Ted Harold	Teletype
Arkansas	Dale Hefner	Veterans Administration
California	Mel Barlow	UCLA
California	Clare Berman	Chula Vista Schools
California	Nancy Billett	California State University
California	Roger Dalton	Physio-Controls
California	L. W. Erickson	UCLA
Colorado	F. Kendrick Bangs	University of Colorado
Delaware	Dick Koffenberger	DuPont
Florida	Oliver Barksdale	Jacksonville University
Florida	Thomas Kemp	Southside Country Day School
Florida	Nancy O'Conner	Miami Chamber of Commerce
Florida	Joyce Sherster	Dade County Junior College
Hawaii	George Kuroda	Aloha Airlines
Illinois	Robert L. Ferguson	Western Illinois University
Indiana	James Crawford	Indiana University
Indiana	Sam Postlethwart	Purdue University
Kansas	Gerald Graham	Wichita State University

CONFEREES/CONSULTANTS OUTSIDE OF MISSISSIPPI

State	Person	Organization
Kansas	Edward G. Rodgers	Wichita State University
Kentucky	Peggy Keck	Western Kentucky University
Louisiana	Miklos George	George Office Machines Co.
Louisiana	Joe Pullis	Louisiana Tech University
Louisiana	Mr. Tebbe	Haspel Brothers
Maine	Terry Goodwin	Casco Bank
Maryland	Margaret Taylor	Leadership Systems
Massachussetts	Mr. Cline	High Voltage Engineering
Massachussetts	Walter Wells	Gillette
Minnesota	Ray Price	University of Minnesota (retired)
Missouri	Alexander Jezunko	Bi-State Public Service
Missouri	Elmer Konradi	Elmer Konradi, Photographer
Montana	Ray Joseph	Anaconda
Montana	Blair Ricks	Montana Power
Nebraska	Gordon Culver	University of Nebraska
New Hampshire	John Kirby	Nashua Corporation
New Jersey	Walter Brower	Rider College
New Jersey	John Dieleuteria	Campbell Soup
New Jersey	Hamden Forkner	Forkner Publishing Company
New York	Rose Palmer	LaGuardia Community College
New York	William Rea	US Coast Guard
North Carolina	Dick Aldrich	Engraph
North Carolina	James Crews	UNC/Greensboro
North Carolina	Dick Harding	Harding and Associates
North Carolina	Fred Herring	Duke Power

CONFEREES/CONSULTANTS OUTSIDE OF MISSISSIPPI

State	Person	Organization
North Carolina	M. O. Kirkpatrick	Kings College (retired)
North Carolina	Jay Meyers	Central Piedmont Community College
North Carolina	Mike Myers	Central Piedmont Community College
North Carolina	Rusty Sitton	Catalytic
North Dakota	Ken Larson	Fargo Chamber of Commerce
Ohio	Merle Guthrie	Bowling Green State University
Ohio	Doris E. Youngman	South-Western Publishing Co.
Oklahoma	Mrs. Coiner	Oklahoma Chamber of Commerce
Oklahoma	Zed DeVaughan	State Department of Education
Oklahoma	Herbert Jelley	Oklahoma State University
Oklahoma	Victor Van Hook	State Department of Education
Oklahoma	Harold Winburn	State Department of Education
Oregon	Mike Brannon	Freightliner
Oregon	Keith Gowing	Portland Chamber of Commerce
Oregon	John Kimmel	Educational Research Associates
Oregon	Paul Koppelman	U. S. Post Office
Oregon	Arnold Quigley	Lamb Weston
Pennsylvania	W. R. Arnold	Alcoa
Pennsylvania	William Pitcher	H. J. Heinz
Pennsylvania	Bernard Zakrzewski	Robert Morris College
Rhode Island	Stewart Taylor	Textron
South Dakota	John H. Brehmer	National Alliance/Businessmen
Tennessee	Malra Treece	Memphis State University
Tennessee	Guy Treece	Memphis Area Vo-Tech
Texas	Arthur Allee	University of Houston

CONFEREES/CONSULTANTS OUTSIDE OF MISSISSIPPI

State	Person	Organization
Texas	C. Lee Meyer	Pasadena Schools
Texas	Billy Pope	Texas Educational Agency
Utah	Mr. Ball	Salt Lake City Chamber of Commerce
Utah	B. M. Richards	B. M. Richards, Attorney
Vermont	Mr. Mitiguy	Howard Bank
Virginia	O. J. Byrnside	NBEA
Virginia	Curtis Hall	Virginia Commonwealth University
Virginia	Carl E. Jorgenson	State Department of Education
Washington	Mrs. Lieberman	Seattle Chamber of Commerce
West Virginia	John McCreary	Glenville State College
West Virginia	Mr. Rogers	Kanawha Manufacturing Co.
Wyoming	Kenneth Baab	Cheyenne Chamber of Commerce